THE PARTES ORATIONIS

AS DISCUSSED BY

VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS

WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS UPON HIS INFLECTION AND SYNTAX

BY

CLEMENT ORESTES MEREDITH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE

1912

THE PARTES ORATIONIS

AS DISCUSSED BY

VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS

WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS UPON HIS INFLECTION AND SYNTAX

BY

CLEMENT ORESTES MEREDITH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BALTIMORE

1912

CONTENTS

NOTE: Page 30, heading Declaratio should be Declinatio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAEBLER, J. J., Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der lateinischen. Grammatik im Mittelalter (Halle a. S., 1885).

BONNET, M., Le Latin de Grègoire de Tours (Paris, 1890).

BUECHELER, F., Grundriss der lateinischen Declination (Bonn, 1879).

COLLIGNON, A., Note sur une grammaire latine manuscrite du viiie siècle appartenant à la Bibliothèque de Nancy, contenant des fragments inédits de Virgilius Maro, Revue de Philologie, Vol. VII. p. 13-22.

DIEZ, F., Romanische Grammatik (Bonn, 1882).

DRAEGER, A., Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache (Leipzig, 1878).

ERNAULT, E., De Virgilio Marone Grammatico Tolosano (Paris, 1886).

GEYER, P., Beiträge zur Kenntnis des gallischen Lateins, Archiv II, 25 f.

GRAMMTICI GRAECI: Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica, ed. G. Uhlig (Leipzig, 1883); Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt, ed. R. Schneider (Leipzig, 1910).

GRAMMATICI LATINI, ex recensione Henrici Keilii (Lipsiae, 1857-1880.

HUEMER, J., Die Epitomae des Grammatikers Virgilius Maro nach dem Fragmentum Vindobonense 19556 (Wien, 1882).

JEEP, L., Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den lateinischen Grammatikern (Leipzig, 1893).

JOB, L., De grammaticis vocabulis apud Latinos (Paris, 1893).

LANDGRAF, G., Historische Grammatik de, lateinischen Sprache. Dritter Band, erstes Heft. (Leipzig, 1903).

MANITIUS, M., Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Erster Teil (München, 1911).

MEYER-LUBKE W., Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen (Leipzig, 1890-1894.

NETTLESHIP, H., The Study of Latin Grammar among the Romans in the First Century A. D. Journal of Philology, Vol. xv (1886), reprinted in Lectures and Essays, second series Oxford, 1895).

NEUE-WAGENER, Lateinische Formenlehre (Berlin, 1902.)

ROGERS, M., L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin. Paris, 1905. Chap. III, sec. 3, pp. 110-126, is devoted to 'Le grammarien Virgile'.

SCHMALZ J. H., Lateinische Grammatik: Syntax und Stilistik [München, 1910].

STANGL, TH., Die grammatischen Schriften des GalliersVirgilius Maro auf Grund einer erstmaligen Vergleichung der Handschriften von Paris und Neapel (München, 1891).

STRONG, H. A., On the Grammarian, Virgilius Maro. Classical Review, XXV [1911] 70-71. This is merely a summary of an article by H. Zimmer.

THUROT, C., Notices et extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge (Paris, 1868).

ZIMMER, H., Der Gasconger Virgilius Maro Grammaticus in Irland (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrg. 1910, 1031-1098).

Editions used:

HUEMER, J., Virgilii Maronis Grammatici Opera (Lipsiae, 1886).

MAI, Ang., Classici Auctores, V, 1-149.

THE PARTES ORATIONIS AS DISCUSSED BY VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS

WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS UPON HIS INFLECTION AND SYNTAX

INTRODUCTION

Very little is known of the late Latin grammarian who calls himself Virgilius Maro Grammaticus. Even his name was assumed, and his date can only be conjectured. Almost all that can be said of him with certainty is that he belonged to Southwestern Gaul, and that he was a Christian.

The name Virgilius Maro was bestowed upon him by his teacher 'Aeneas': (92, 18) unde Aeneas cum me vidisset ingeniosum hoc me vocabulo iussit nominari dicens: *hic filius meus Maro vocabitur, quia in eo antiqui Maronis spiritus redivivit.* In this same passage (92, 21) he speaks of his grandfather 'Martulis': hic in arte grammatica diligentissimus. And at 28, 1 he mentions an uncle named 'Samminius'.

He is commonly assigned to the seventh century, though various dates have been suggested for him, ranging all the way from the fifth century to the ninth. Angelo Mai (Class. Auct. V, ix) identified him with the Virgilius Maro who is mentioned by Ennodius, Carm. ii, 118,

In tantum prisci defluxit fama Maronis,
  Ut te Virgilium saecula nostra darent,

and ii, 120,

Captivo stultus congaudet stemmate vatis.
  Non est Virgilius, dicitur iste tamen.

This, however, has met with very little favor from other scholars. F. Osann (Beiträge, i–ii, p. 126 f.) assigned him to the ninth century—on the inconclusive reasoning that his Latin is not very good, and that his contemporaries were fond of assuming the names of the great writers of antiquity.[1] L. Traube (Hermes, xxiv, 647) set a definite limit by finding in one of the letters of Aldhelmus a quotation which Virgilius had already used. That is, Aldhelmus (p. 95 Giles) quotes a line from one of the grammarian's authorities, Glengus: Si vero quippiam, inscitia suppeditante, garrula frontose convincitur pagina prompsisse: ut versidicus ait:

Digna fiat fante glingio guro fugax fambulo.

And this is to be connected with Virgilius, 121, 9: verumtamen ne in illud Glengi incedam, quod cuidam confiictum fugienti dicere fidenter ausus est *gurgo* inquit *fugax fambulo dignus est*, etc. M. Manitius has proposed a limit in the other direction, on the ground that many of Virgilius' etymologies are derived from Isidorus.[2] His 'floruit' would thus fall later than Isidorus (d. 636) and earlier than Aldhelmus (d. 709), and he should probably be assigned to the middle of the seventh century. H. Zimmer, by an elaborate argument, has placed him, at the latest, at the end of the fifth century or about the beginning of the sixth, and set his 'floruit' about two generations later than Ausonius, one generation later than Sulpicius Severus.[3]

---

[1] So the group of scholars who were gathered at the Court of Charlemagne used to call each other by the names of great ancient poets. Alcuin was Flaccus, one of his disciples was Naso, Angilbert was Homerus. See Ad. Ebert, Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande, ii 64.

[2] Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, München, 1911, p. 120.

[3] Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1910, p. 1067.

Virgilius himself tells us indirectly that he was a Gaul: (137, 30) in quibusdam Gallorum nostrorum scriptis; and his expression 'bigerro sermone clefabo' (8, 13) apparently refers to the district of Bigorre, just north of the Pyrenees. A reference in Abbo Floriacensis indicates that he lived in Toulouse: Scripulus appenditur xvi granis lentis, licet Virgilius Tolosanus in suis opusculis asserat pensari xviii granis hordei, etc.[1] And in the title of the Fragmentum Mediolanense he is called Virgilius presbyter Hispanus. Zimmer (op. cit. 1071) argues that this last indiction is not inconsistent with the others; that from 415 to the middle of the sixth century the West Goths held sway both north and south of the Pyrenees, and that from 507 on the region north of the Pyrenees might very well be regarded merely as an appanage of their Spanish kingdom. He further maintains (p. 1092 f.) that Virgilius visited Ireland in the last quarter of the fifth century, and that he had a very considerable influence upon the language of Irish poetry for the next two hundred years. And a recent conjecture by H. A. Strong, *Hibernorum* for *Hibonorum* (26, 3), is offered as confirming this opinion.[2]

A single passage may be quoted to show that Virgilius was a Christian: (108, 17) in tribus divinae unitatem substantiae personis coaeternaliter subsistentem.[3] He was thus a 'Homoousian' a fact which qualified him (in Zimmer's theory, p. 1094) to take part in the great exodus of Ortho-

---

[1] Mai, Class. Auct. v, 349, n. 1. The statement here ascribed to Virgilius Tolosanus does not appear in our Virgilius' extant works, and it may come from some other writer of the same name. Still, Abbo's Virgilius Tolosanus and our Virgilius are now commonly regarded as one and the same person; cf., e. g., E. Ernault (p. 11): Tolosanum Virgilium esse nostrum censeo, quia certum est scholam eius in Aquitania floruisse, ubi Hiberni, qui cum eadem regione saepe communicabant, illam doctrinam noverunt, susceperunt et ipsi postea Anglo-Saxones docuerunt.

[2] Classical Review, xxv, (1911) 201.

[3] For other evidence, see 107, 7; 129, 12; 133, 20; 175, 12.

dox Christians from Gascony to Ireland before the persecution of the Arian West Goths.

His writings, so far as they have survived, are all of a grammatical character. There are fifteen Epitomae: 1 De Sapientia, 2 De Litera, 3 De Syllaba, 4 De Metris, 5 De Nomine, 6 De Pronomine, 7 De Verbo, 8 De Adverbio, 9 De Participio, 10 De Coniunctione, 11 De Praepositione, 12 De Interiectione, 13 De Scinderatione Fonorum, 14 De Cognominationibus Nominum atque Verborum, 15 De Catalogo Grammaticorum. There are also eight Epistolae, devoted to the eight parts of speech. He speaks himself of an earlier set of fifteen Epistolae sent to his young friend Fabianus: (107, 5) in xv epistolarum Affricam missarum volumine. At 25, 1 he mentions a metrical treatise which he had written: de safico autem et heroico versuum metro in quadam epistola, quam inter duodecim ad Donatum Romam missimus, discribsisse me sufficienter memini. And at 175, 11 he mentions a bit of religious controversy in which he had engaged: cum librum de mundi creatione commentarium adversus paganos ediderim.

The very subjects of some of his Epitomae may prepare the reader for a somewhat unusual treatment of Latin grammar. The first and firteenth give some account of the twelve dialects of Latin, the thirteenth gives examples and rules for various kinds of cryptic writing.[1] Such topics suggest that Virgilius is of less importance for the study of late Latin in general or of Gallic Latin as a whole than for the specific forms of Latin which were written and spoken in Southwestern Gaul in his day.

His own position as a grammarian is the more puzzling, because he never quotes a classical author, or even one of the Grammatici Latini. Some of his authorities, like him-

---

[1] Zimmer, op. cit., 1038 f., finds parallels in Old Irish poetry. For the twelve dialects of Latin, cf., also, Hisperica Famina (ed. Jenkinson, Cambridge, 1908, p. 5): Bis senos exploro vechros qui ausonicam lacerant palatham.

self, had borrowed ancient and honorable names: Cato, Cicero, Donatus, Homerus, Honoratus, Horatius, Lucanus, Propetius, Quintilianus, Terrentius. Others bore such names as Balapsidus, Bregandus Lugenicus, Falanges, Fassica, Iscenus, Mitterius, Sabatinus, Siva. But these men, if they ever existed at all, may all have been his own contemporaries, or residents of his own region.[1] There is a similar variety in the names of his teachers. These were, Aeneas: (34, 1) cum me Aeneas sciscientem adhuc rudemque discipulum lucide vellet inbuere;[2] Galbungus: (60, 13) ab omni scola Galbungi, quam et ego adivi; Gratianus: (63, 2) Gratiano magistro fretus, cuius in scola decem annos feci; Reginus Cornelius: (133, 18) qui me quoque.... docuit; Sulpita and Istrius: (24, 7) praeceptores nostri et praecipue Sulpita atque Istrius.

Some of the theories, and some of the incidents, which Virgilius reports give one a rather discouraging picture of the grammatical studies of his country and time. For example, Galbungus and Terrentius once debated for fourteen days and as many nights over the vocative of 'ego': (123, 16) quattuordecim diebus totidemque noctibus in contentione mansisse refferuntur. Regulus and Sedulus carried on a still longer and more heated controversy over the inchoative verbs: (138, 25) non minima quaestio habita est, quae usque ad gladiorum pene conflictum pervenit. quindecim namque noctibus totidemque simul diebus insomes et indapes mansere, tribus militibus utrimque sumptis. And the 'catalogus grammaticorum' (87, 23) reminds one of Trimolchio's account of the origin of Corinthian bronze:

---

[1] At 49, 17 he reports that he once attended a congress of not less than thirty grammarians. It is hardly safe to assume, as many scholars have done, that Virgilius invented all his authorities. Manitius suggests (op. cit., 121 n. 1) that foreign names of places are sometimes used to designate places in Gaul — for example, Arabia, Endia, Africa (92, 12) — that perhaps Africa (107, 5; 164, 8) means Spain, Europa (109, 15; 164, 8) means France.

[2] See, also, 60,14; 62,23; 92,18.

Primus igitur fuit quidam senex Donatus apud Troiam, quem ferunt mille vixisse annos. hic cum ad Romulum, a quo condita est Roma urbs, venisset, gratulantissime ab eodem susceptus, IIII continuos ibi fecit annos, scolam construens et innumerabilia opuscula relinquens.....fuit itidem apud Troiam quidam Virgilius eiusdem Donati auditor, qui in discribendis versibus diligentissimus erat, qui LXX volumina de ratione metri scribens et epistolam ad Virgilium Assianum missam de verbi explanatione....hunc vidi meis oculis, et pueruIo mihi notas caraxavit. It may be said, however, that our author's own Latinity is much better than these passages might lead one to suspect.

This statement may be made with confidence, as it rests upon a somewhat detailed examination of his usage. The following investigation attempts in a similar manner to gain a more definite idea of his ability and training as a grammarian. It proceeds upon the well-known fact that grammar in general, and antique grammar in particular, is both exact and conservative to a remarkable degree. The varying theories of individual scholars or of different schools are clearly marked in scholastic tradition. Technical terms, definitions, the arrangement and division of topics, even the examples chosen for paradigms and illustrations, are passed down from generation to generation. In this preliminary investigation, therefore, I have confined myself to the parts of speech and have applied these tests to Virgilius by comparing his statements with parallel material in the corpus of Latin Grammarians. In some cases, unfortunately, the chronological sequence of these grammarians cannot be certainly established. Experience, however, has shown that in this particular investigation no important point has been seriously affected by lack of definite dates.

The Parts of Speech [1]

Virgilius suggests (5,4 ff.) that the parts of speech should be called partes latinitatis, [2] rather than partes orationis. For latinitas, which is derived from latitudo ipsius linguae, is a broader term than oratio, which properly means the ornate language of the orator: (5,10) haec autem latinitas propter oratorum ornatissimum leporem oratio nuncupatur, unde et partes orationis intellegendae sunt partes latinitatis. This discussion is a more or less distant echo of such definitions or derivations of oratio as Scaurus ap. Diomed. (K. I 300,19); Dositheus, (K. VII 389,8); Charisius (K. I 152,11); Explanat. (K. IV 487,23); Pompeius (K. V 96,19); Victorinus (K. VI 192,3); Audax, (K. VII 324,9); Priscian, (K. II 53,27). 'Partes orationis' (μέρη τοῦ λόγου) appears first in Varro,—see Job, p. 162,—and becomes traditional. The attempt to solve the difficulty by substituting Latinitatis for orationis has not been observed outside of Virgilius and his teacher 'Aeneas'.

At 107,3 he says that there are eight parts of speech: orationis partes octo sunt. This is the number recognized by Palaemon, (see Quintilian, I 4,20), and by all the Grammatici Latini except Priscian, who omits the interjection and gives only seven (K. II 55,6 ff.).

At 42,13 he reports that some grammarians counted the pronomen with the nomen, the participle with the verb, the conjunction with the adverb; and so made only five parts: in divisione omnium partium orationis alii octo partes dixere, nonnulli eundem numerum minuentes nomen et pronomen in eandem partem redigendum esse putave-

---

[1] For the parallel references to the Grammatici Latini, see Jeep, p. 122.

[2] So his teacher 'Aeneas' said (26,10): ergo principalis pars latinitatis est.

runt. verbum quoque et participium in unum conglomerantes absurdum dixerunt velut a corpore membrum ita a verbo separare participium. adverbia autem et coniunctiones unam partem esse putaverunt sequestratis praepossitione et interiectione atque ita erat, ut pro octo partibus quinque annumeraverint. This division into five parts was originally due to the Stoics (Servius, K. IV 428, 13; Cledonius, K. V 34, 23; Pompeius, K. V 135, 26; Priscian, K. II 54, 8). For a discussion of this Stoic theory, see Jeep, p. 123.

Virgilius discusses the parts of speech in the order 1 nomen, 2 pronomen, 3 verbum, 4 adverbium, 5 participium, 6 coniunctio, 7 praepositio, 8 interiectio. This is the order of the grammarians, with the exception of Probus (K. V 57,18), who gives the verbum the last place; and Priscian, who gives verbum the second place, participium the third, pronomen the fourth (K. II 54,8; 55f.), and omits the interjection. He remarks that the Hiberni put the verb first: (26, 4) cum in Hibonorum[1] elocutione et conpossitione primatum estimatur verbum. But his teacher Aeneas insisted that the first place should be given to the nomen: (26,5) super hoc Aeneas X libros edidit, ex quibus ego unum tantum sumere oportunum puto. *quassum nomen* inquit *secundum sensum principium est, non secundum appellationem. cum enim nascitur homo, antequam rem aliquam agat vel discat vel sciat, nomen illi inditur. nomen ergo principalis pars latinitatis est.* The nearest parallel to this statement of Aeneas is a statement in Pompeius (K. V 96, 27): et bene primum positum est nomen. non enim potes tractare de littera, de voce, nisi prius scias, quid est hoc ipsum. idcirco quoniam nomina primigenia sunt in rebus omnibus, haec prima debent poni. nemo enim potest tractare primo de aliis partibus. For the nomen and verbum

---

[1] H. A. Strong conjectures Hibernorum, Classical Review xxv (1911) p. 201.

as 'principales partes' see Donatus, K. IV 372,26; Servius, K. IV 428,8; Consentius, K. V 338,6.

The Nomen[1]

Virgilius' conception of the nomen can be gathered only from a comparison of his own treatment of it with that of the other grammarians. He himself does not define it. Donatus (K. IV 355,4) defines it as follows: nomen est pars orationis cum casu corpus aut rem proprie communiterque significans. The definition of Priscian is the same in substance (K. II 56,28). Charisius (K. I 152,16) has: cum casu sine tempore. Later grammarians omit cum casu: see, for instance, Consentius (K. V 338,10), Cledonius (K. V 34, 26). Virgilius, to judge from his treatment of the nomen, would probably say: 'nomen' is a part of speech (26,3), having qualitas (26,12, comparatio (29,18), genus (31,8), numerus (32,14), figura (33,1), casus (35,12). This outline and order is found only in Donatus (K. IV 355,6), and Consentius (K. V 338,16). Charisius (K. I 153,6) does not include comparation, and Priscian (K. II 57,8) has species instead of qualitas. In Diomedes (K.I 320,27) qualitas stands last.

Nomen, Qualitas[2]

The Grammatici Latini divide nouns into propia (κύρια), and appellativa (προσηγορικά), or, as we say, 'proper' and 'common'.[3] The terms appear first with Julius Romanus, and are used by all the Grammatici Latini. Definition as

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 124.

[2] See Jeep, p. 125.

[3] So, for instance, Diomedes (K. I 320,29), qualitas nominum bipertita est. aut enim propria sunt nomina aut appellativa: quaedam et propria sunt et appellativa.

such is generally clear and true to the tradition.[1] Confusion and incompleteness, however, in their sphere and application is initial with the Greek Grammarians, and recurs with monotonous regularity in their Roman followers. Only Pompeius (K. V 139,25; cf. Explanat. in Donat., K. IV 490, 37) seems to realize that these divisions should be exclusive and cover the entire field. Others, and for that matter even Pompeius himself, discuss primitives, derivatives, patronymics, etc., either under appellativa or as further divisions of nouns in general. Sometimes the nomen proprium is defined simply as consisting of praenomen, nomen, cognomen, agnomen, and in no case is the discussion of these types omitted.

In his treatment of qualitas Virgilius is unusually difficult and obscure.

'The qualitas of nouns,' he says (26,12), 'is not two-fold, as some think, but manifold; it consists of many different species. Nevertheless, in their discussions of nomina propria and nomina appellativa some persons insist upon assuming that there is such a thing in Latin as a nomen propium (i. e., a noun proper and singular to and by itself). The fact is that (no Latin noun is proprium in this sense), all Latin nouns, for that matter all Latin words, are so closely interrelated that each depends upon the other and is derived or 'named' from it. Proprius, therefore, as applied to nouns, must not be given its obvious and ordinary meaning; it has a certain deeper and more subtle significance which must be divined. Now proprius has two meanings; it connotes the idea of specialitas, something

---

[1] So Charisius (K. I 533,12), propria sunt nomina quae specialiter proprieque dicuntur....appellativa nomina sunt quae generaliter communiterque dicuntur. Diomedes (K. I 320,39), propria sunt quae propriam et circumscriptam qualitatem specialiter significant .... appellativa nomina sunt quae generaliter communiterque dicuntur. Consentius (K. V 338,19), appellativa enim nomina a genere et specie manant: propria ab individuis.

inherent, special and peculiar (the obvious and usual meaning discussed above), or it means superiority in position. This is shown by the fact that proprius is applied to persons who, because of their rank or fortune, are ascribed to the foremost position in a state; hence, 'Cicero', writing of a certain Roman named Justinus, began thus: 'Iustinus autem proprius omnium sese obdedit, that is, primus omnium'. Nomina propria, therefore, should be called nomina primaria, as Roma, Carthago. Further, nomina communia are of inferior rank, as *civitas*.

As regards *res* and *corpus*, many are at a loss. *Res* is a Hebrew letter which means 'head'. [1] *Res*, therefore, is the equivalent of *nomen primarium*. Hence, just as an army of inferior rank (cf. what is said of *nomina communia* above) is lead by a primarius, a person of foremost position, so all the *corpus*, the body, is ruled by the head (*corpus*, then, is the equivalent of nomen commune).

Further, *nomina appellativa* have many species, etc.: [2]
(26,12) Qualitas nominum non bipertita, ut quidem rentur, sed multipertita; variis siquidem et multis consistit speciebus. nonnulli tamen de propriis et appellativis nominibus quaestiones obtendere constant, quasi proprium sit aliquod nomen latinum. omnia namque nomina latina, immo omnia fona ita invicem conexa sunt, ut quodque sicut alteri heret ita ab altero appelletur. propria ergo nomina non secundum simplicem sonum sonanda sunt, sed secundum subtiliorem quandam interpretationem. proprietas quippe duas res significat aut specialitatem aut propriorem ordinem: proprii enim recte dicuntur qui in primordio ciuitatum honore vel dignitate vel censu scribuntur, unde et Cicero de

---

[1] See Isaac Taylor, THE ALPHABET, 1883, Vol. I. p. 174: 'RESH' clearly means the head, and the Hieratic form sufficiently suggests the oval of the head, supported by the neck.'

[2] The remainder of our author's discussion is concerned with a miscellaneous assortment of types, many of which, as we saw above, are regularly associated with the topic of appellativa.

Iustino quodam Romano scribens ita infiuit *Iustinus autem proprius omnium sese obdedit hoc* est *primus omnium.* propria ergo nomina primaria dicenda sunt ut *Roma Carthago.* communia autem inferioris ordinis sunt ut *civitas.* de *re* autem et *corpore* multi hessitant. res hebrea litera est quae interpretatur caput, res ergo hoc est quod et primarium nomen. sicut ergo a primario quolibet ducatur exercitus inferior, ita et capite corpus omne regitur. appellativa autem nomina multifidas species habent, etc.'

The gist of Virgilius' argument, such as it is, seems to be about as follows:

The traditional two-fold division into propria and appellativa ('ut quidam rentur' includes, as we have seen, all the Grammatici Latini) must be rejected. This follows from the fact that proprius in its ordinary traditional sense (again 'nonnulli constant' includes all the Grammatici Latini) cannot be applied to nouns of any sort. No Latin noun can be inherently sole and singular. On the contrary, they are all so interdependent that 'quoque ab altero appelletur.' The true meaning of proprius in this connection, as of other technical terms used by the great scholars of old, is, of course, hidden from the ordinary eye. In this case the deeper meaning of *proprius* is *primus*, *primarius*, i. e., 'foremost'. This is shown by 'Cicero's' *proprius omnium* in the sense of 'the first, the foremost, man of all.' Nomina propria, therefore, are, properly speaking, nomina primaria, the master-nouns, the leaders and lords in the world of nomina. It follows, then, that nomina communia are of the lower orders, they are nouns of the common herd.

It is unnecessary to say that despite the quotation from some contemporary 'Cicero', this 'deeper' meaning of proprius has no warrant in genuine Latin usage. Nor can we point with certainty to the source from which this meaning was derived. We may assume, however, that Virgilius and his teachers were well aware of the fact that nomen proprium was a translation of κύριον ὄνομα. It may be, therefore, that the theory of proprius here elaborated was derived

ultimately from the more common meaning of κύριος — lord or master — especially frequent and familiar since Christian times in the substantive use ὁ Κύριος, the Master par excellence, the Lord of the world. The 'Ciceronian' example quoted by Virgilius was doubtless itself inspired by the same theory, and as such is probably a good illustration of some one of the 'twelve kinds of Latinity' to which our author alludes in 88,22. Having once set up the theory that propria nomina were primaria, it followed of course that all others were of lower rank; in other words, nomina communia are not 'common' because communiter dicta, but 'common' because they belong to the common herd. It may be remarked in passing that the reference here to nomina communia implies that the use of nomen commune in the sense of nomen appellativum (from which our 'common' noun was derived) was already familiar to scholars. With the exception, however, of Serg. Explanat. in Donat. (K. IV 490, 15), proprium est quod unius est, commune quod multorum est — but again a few lines below, appellativum est quod multorum est (cf. Probus, K. IV 119, 26)—the word is never so used by the Grammatici Latini. In Priscian (K. II 156, 10 and III 472, 20) nomina communia are nouns having a 'common' gender.

Having disposed of nomina propria and communia, Virgilius takes up the matter of 'abstracts' and 'concretes'; for this is what is meant by the discussion at this point of *res* and *corpus*. It is also practically certain that the ultimate source of the discussion was Donatus. The Grammatici Latini divide appellativa into corporalia ('concretes'), and incorporalia ('abstracts'). Donatus alone includes *all* nouns in this division, and designates abstracts by *res*, concretes by *corpus* (K. IV 373,1), nomen est pars orationis cum casu *corpus* aut *rem* proprie communiterve significans. His model was evidently Dionysius Thrax (Grammatici Graeci, I^1, ed. Uhlig, Leipzig, 1883, p. 24, ὄνομά ἐστι μέρος λόγου πτωτικόν, σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα σημαῖνον . . . κοινῶς τε καὶ ἰδίως λεγόμενον; cf. Uhlig's note ad loc. and Apollonius Dyscolus, id. II^3, p. 38.

Res, however, like proprius, has a hidden meaning. Res in this difinition is not the ordinary *res*. It is the Hebrew letter *resh*, and therefore means the 'head'. Res-nouns are, therefore, the same as nomina primaria, and as the body is subject to the head, corpus-nouns are the same as nomina communia. Finally Virgilius divides appellativa into a number of species, which need not concern us here.

To resume briefly, it would appear that according to Virgilius nouns are divided into primaria (patricians) and communia (plebeians). Then there are appellativa (i. e., common nouns in the traditional sense?). These are divided into many species. Of course, the division is illogical and futile, but it is doubtless a fair sample of the methods and results of scholastic discussion in Virgilius' time.

Virgilius follows the traditional treatment in making nomen include both noun and adjective. However, he implies a distinction:[(29, 16)] omnia dirivativa nomina adiecta semper sunt;[(46,3)] at omnis nomen est adiectivum.[1] Quintilian (K. I 4,20) says that some of the Greeks counted the adjective as a separate part of speech. Priscian (K.II 83,18) in his treatment of comparatio, calls words which are subject to comparison 'nomina adiectiva'; Derivantur igitur comparativa a nominibus adiectivis. And at 844 he says: itaque adectiva iure sunt appellata, quae illis nominibus, quae substantiam demonstrant, adiciuntur. Virgilius in his remarks on comparison, where one would expect a classification of the words subject to comparison, does not mention nomina adiectiva. Donatus calls such words as magnus fortis 'epitheta', and translates, 'id est adiectiva'. For other references to 'adiectiva', see Servius on Donatus (K. IV 430, 13), Pompeius (K. V 147, 13), Dositheus (K. VII 398, 4).

---

[1] At 29,15 he says that all derivatives are adiecta: sciendum quod omnia dirivativa nomina adiecta semper sunt.

Nomen, Comparatio [1]

To Virgilius the positive with the genitive — although this is a solecism — may have the force of the superlative: (29, 19) possitivus gradus cum genitivo servit, licet ex sollicismo, tamen superlativi facit opus ut *sapiens sapientum*, quasi hoc diceret *sapientissimus sapientum*. And so may the illogical but old-fashioned comparative with the genitive: (29, 21) nonnumquam etiam conparativus gradus cum genitivo cassui adheserit, superlativi opus facit et hoc non rationis sed vetustatis est, dicis enim *maior omnium*, acsi dixisses maximus. [2]

The superlative (instead of the comparative) [3] with the ablative plural is a 'barbarism': (30,2) sed hoc barbaricum est Done dicente tu *es omnibus fortissimus regibus*, hoc dicit *fortior omnibus*. And so is the use of the positive instead of the comparative: (30, 17) *suo magnus doctore* for *maior; rationabilis omnibus* for *rationabilior*. [4] Still, this barbarism may be defended from the usage of many scholarly people: (30, 19) sed haec licet indubitatam nobis autoritatem non exhibeant, tamen quia a plerisque gnarissimis viris ussurpata sunt, apertam diffissionem inferre non debent.

Virgilius states (30,4) that his contemporaries often debated the important question, whether a comparative might be followed by either the ablative singular or the ablative plural. On the high authority of 'Aeneas', he decides the question in the affirmative: (30, 10) ego Aeneam, quem falli in nulla erat possibile ratione, sequens confidenter assero,

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 155.

[2] Cf. Plaut. Capt. 825, regum rex regalior; Enn. Trag. 41 R, optumarum multo mulier melior mulierum; Aug. De. Spir. et An., 56, omnium miseriarum miserius.

[3] In Gregory of Tours the comparative is often used for the superlative; see Bonnet, p. 452.

[4] A Hebraism. See Schmalz, Lat. Styl. 1910, p. 547 and ref.

quod conparativus gradus utriusque numeri cassui ablativo rectissime serviat. [1]

Such expressions as *maior maximo* are incongruous, because they subordinate the superlative to the comparative: (30,22) conparativus gradus superlativo incongruentissime praeponitur ut *maior maximo:* superlativus quippe omnibus superequitat. [2] Certain positives, because of their meaning, may be used instead of a superlative: (31,6) dicimus enim *praecipuus omnium, egregius patrum, cernuus regum.* [3]

At 11,4 we have the superlative *magnissimo;* at 127, 15 we are told that some people use the comparative *pluriores:* sum *pluriores* a quibusdam scribantur; at 174,16 we have the comparative *proximiorem.* [4]

Nomen, Genus [5]

Virgilius recognizes four genders, masculine, feminine, neuter, common: (31,8) quadriforma genera sunt sicut omnibus patet legentibus. But under the name 'common' he includes what some grammarians [6] had counted as a fifth

---

[1] Cf. Donati Ars Gram. IV 375, 4 K, conparativus gradus ablativo casui adiungitur utriusque numeri. So, also, Charisii Inst. Gram. I 115, 4 K; Diomedis Ars. Gram, 8 325, 9 K; Prisciani Inst. II 94, 10 K; Consentii Ars, V 342, 19 K; Dosithei Ars Gram. VII 401, 4 K.

[2] Cf. Donat. Ars Gram., IV 374, 27 K, saepe autem conparativus gradus praeponitur superlativo, ut stultior stultissimo et maior maximo; Diomedis Ars Gram. I 325, 1 K; Consentii Ars, V 342, 27 K; Pompei Comm. V 155, 8 K. Plautus, Amph. 907, has stultior stultissimo; Lactantius, Inst. 5,15,9, inferior infimis; Hieronymus, 30, 160 M, minor minimo; Augustinus, 37, 1885 M, excellentissimo excellentior.

[3] Cf. Plaut. Trin. 1115, hic homost omnium hominum praecipuos, and Virgilius himself (42,11) cum verbum omnium partium egregium sit.

[4] Magnissimus is cited from the Historia de preliis, 1,2; 1,47; 2,8; 3,17 (Neue, II 207); pluriores, from Victor Vitensis, 3,32, pluriora, from Fulgent. Myth. 1 praef. 5,16 and Itala, Ioann. 7,31 (Neue, II 208); proximior occurs in Seneca, Ep. 108, 16, and often later (Neue, II 233).

[5] See Jeep, p. 127.

[6] See Dionysius Thrax, Gram. Graeci, I^1, p. 25, with Uhlig's note.

gender, 'genus [1] omne': (31,14) commune autem genus duplex est, etc. He makes it cover not only substantives which have but one form for two genders, but also words which have the same form for all genders alike: (32,11) nomina autem, quae omnibus generibus aptantur, non communia sed omnigena dici debent ut *felix velox verax amens dives prudens.*

As for nouns of common gender, some are masculine and feminine: (31,15) etenim masculino genere et femino communia sunt ut *sacerdos dies finis renis lacus;* [2] some are masculine and neuter: (32,4) communia etiam masculino et neutro inveniuntur ut *fulgor murmor frigus buxus;* [3] some are feminine and neuter: (32,5) sunt et feminino et neutro communia ut *tellus holus.*

Names of animals and birds can have no special gender until one sees what is the sex of the animal: (32,6) omnis autem animalis aut avis nomen proprium genus habere non potest, antequam discernatur cuius sit generis [4] exceptis dumtaxat hiis, quibus propria in utroque genere nomina possita sunt ut *taurus* et *vacca, bos bovis, aries* et *ovis.*

At 110,11 Virgilius mentions a simple rule — already obsolete but not entirely inadmissible — that names of males are masculine, names of females are feminine, names of 'material things' are neuter: quidam simpliciter dixerunt,

---

[1] So Probus, K. IV 52,5; Donatus, K. IV 375,13; Servius, Comm. in Donat., K. IV 408,7. Cf. Apoll. Dyscolus, Gramm. Graeci, II^{3}, Leipzig, 1910, p. 59.

[2] Lacus acus domus, when masculine, belong to the second declension, when feminine, to the fourth (31,17f.). Other nouns of common gender have different forms of the nominative in the same declension: (32,2) lapes pulves cines masculina sunt, lapis pulvis cinis feminina sunt, sed declinatio eadem est.

[3] Donatus (K. V 375,34) makes buxus feminine and neuter: sunt incerti generis inter femininum et neutrum, ut buxus, pirus, prunus, malus. So Consentius (K. V 345,26).

[4] Cf. Servii Comm. in Donat., K. IV 408,9, nam inter commune et epicoenon hoc interest, quod commune est, ubi visu secernimus sexum, ut canis; epicoenon est e contrario ubi visu non secernimus sexum, ut piscis; Explanat. in Donat. id. 494,4; Pompeius, (K. V 161,26).

quod masculinum hoc esse debuit, quod secundum habitudinem corporis ostenderetur et ita femininum ut *vir* et *mulier, taurus* et *vacca, aries* et *ovis, canis* et *cata* et cetera animalia. omnes autem res materiales ut *lapides* et *arbores* et siqua sunt similia, neutralia dici debere censuerunt. inde dicebant *hic vir* et *haec mulier* et *hoc lapis* et *hoc arbor* et *hoc cera* et *hoc panis* et *hoc domus* et *hoc manus.* moneo itaque te, o frater carissime, ut quamuis non hac nunc consuetudine scribendi utamur, tamen quia hoc aput veteres pro recto habeatur, siquid forte huiusmodi scriptum repperieris licet non ad indubitatam auctoritatem refferendum putes, tamen quod a veteribus usurpatum est, reprehendere omnino non debes.

In his own usage the following peculiarities may be noted:

Articulum, n.: (46,24) articulum est hoc quod non pro nomine sed cum ipso nomine flectitur ut *hic pater.*

Moda, f. (cf. Fr. *la mode*): (4,2) unde et conparationum gradus hac moda ponimus.

Poema, f.: (17,24) poema sui varietate contenta angusta atque obscura est, etc.

For several words he gives two nominative forms, usually with a difference of meaning: *caelus, caelum* (120,6); *iocus, iocum, locus, locum* (41,15); *sibilus, sibilum, tartarus, tartarum* (120,20); *vesper* (n.), *vespera* (112,16.)

NUMERUS[1]

Virgilius admits three numbers — singular, plural, common (32,14): De numeris autem hoc tantum dicendum est, quod sequestrata singularitate et pluralitate manifesta multa communia utrique numero inveniuntur ut *sepes nubes dies clades fames sedes vultus tribus gresus,* et cetera. Doatus (K. IV 355, 18), Servius (K. IV 468, 17), Sergius (K.

---

[1] See Jeep. p. 132.

IV 494, 31) Charisius (K. I 18, 1), Diomedes (K. I 301, 20), Priscian (K. II 172, 2), Dositheus (K. VII 392, 4) recognize only two. Probus (K. IV 74, 22), Cledonius (K. V 10, 19), Pompeius (K. V 165, 20) admit also a common number. Almost all the grammarians say that duo and ambo are dual in Greek, but add that Latin has no dual. Of the words cited above by Virgilius as common number, *sepes clades fames sedes* point to a confusion of quantity in the final syllable. Compare his discussion of the *i* and *ii* genitive (113,24 f.). He says that *terra* is plural in sense (32, 18): at *terra*, in qua hominum genus est, *turba* ac *tribus populus plebs contio*, licet singularem numerum praeferunt, pluralia tamen manifestantur ex sensu. The grammarians speak of no such use of *terra*.

Nomen, Figura[1]

Virgilius gives two figuræ, simplex and composita (33,1). So, also, Donatus (K. IV 355, 20), Probus (K. IV 53, 19), Servius (K. IV 408, 20), Sergius (414, 34), Cledonius (K. V 11, 10), Pompeius (K. V 168, 1), Consentius (K. V 449, 21). Priscian (K. II 197, 10) gives three — simplex, composita, decomposita. Compounds are formed by '*modi integri*' or '*modi corrupti*'. These modi are explained by Donatus (K. IV 355, 21): Quibus modis nomina componuntur? Quattuor: ex duobus integris, ut suburbanus; ex duobus corruptis, ut efficax municeps; ex integro et corrupto, ut insulsus; ex corrupto et intergo, ut nugigerulus. Pompeius (K. V 169, 7) makes the meaning even clearer than Donatus: nosti enim quoniam aut utraque parte conponitur integrum aut corruptum, aut prima parte integra et posteriore corrupta, aut parte posteriore integra et priore corrupta. This rule would mean that compounds are made (1) by putting two words together without any change in

---

[1] See Jeep. p. 131.

either, as sub and urbanus; (2) when both change, as ex and facie, efficio; (3) when the first word in the compound is unchanged, the second changed, as in salsus insulsus; (4) when the first word is changed, the second unchanged, as nugae gerulus nugigerulus. The rule given by Donatus and Pompeius is the same in substance as that given by the other grammarians; see Charisius (K. I 153, 22), Diomedes (K. I 301, 25), Priscian (K. II 178, 16).

Virgilius knew the terms *modi integri* and *modi corrupti.* At 33, 6 he says: conpossitio autem nominum per modos fit, qui modi aut integri aut corrupti sunt. He seems to know also that the 'modi corrupti' involved an abridgement or change of the two component parts, and vice-versa: (33,8) corruptis autem integritas non est quaerenda sicut nec integris adimenda, quia enim corrupti dicuntur, non quod integri ante fuerint, sed quia soli latine dici non queunt. The grammarians cited above are all agreed upon four modi, and give examples to illustrate what they mean. Virgilius gives neither a definite number of modi, nor does he outline the various combinations with examples of each. His teacher Aeneas claimed that the modi in these compounds could not contain more than two or three letters each: (33,10) legimus dicente Aenea, quia hii modi conpossitionum duarum vel trium literarum numerum non excedant. Virgilius cites *integer* and *insulsus*[1] as examples of a combination of three modi (33,12): dicimus enim tribus modis *integer* novissimo corrupto, *insulsus* medio corrupto. He seems to interpret *integer* as a compound of *in* and *te* (pronoun), the modi integri, *ger* (gero), the modus corruptus. Probus (K. IV 55, 22) gives *viator* as an example of the two *modi integri* and one *modus corruptus: via* noun in the ablative case, *a* a preposition, *tor* vi-a-tor.

Virgilius holds that of the monosyllabic nomina only ad-

---

[1] Many of his contemporaries regarded these as words of two modi (33,14).

jectives can be compounded (33,18): monosyllaba autem nomina conponi non possunt praeter adiecta ut *ers iners, sons insons.* For this statement I have found no traditional authority.

Nomen, Casus[1]

Virgilius does not concern himself with the derivation and meaning of *casus*[2] — a matter which caused much discussion among the grammarians when the term was applied to the nominative and vocative.[3]

He gives the number of cases as six — corresponding to the various activities of men: (35,12) Casus sunt sex: quare? quia sex negotia homines agunt: nominant generant dant agunt vocant auferunt. unde hii quoque casus hanc summan accipiunt. He explains that *accusativus* means *activus* — because *accusare* means *agere*: (36,1) Cicero etenim sic dicit *accusate quod rectum est,* hoc est *agite.* Terrentius quoque *quare non accusatis paenitudinem?* Gelbidius etiam de Ambrosio *omnia* inquit *laude accusavit digna* pro *agebat.* unde intellegitur quod accusativus cassus ab hoc vocatur, quia verbo heret activo. et verius dicam: accusativus ipse activus erit. But he distinguishes the ablative proper from the instrumental and other uses of the same case — the 'septimus casus'.[4] The ablative takes a

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 134.

[2] This, however, was evidently due to epitomizing. See the excerpt from some more complete text of Virgilius, in Collignon, Rev. d. Philologie, 1883, p. 20.

[3] See Charisius (K. I 154,6), Priscian (K. II 183,20;185,12) Donatus (K. IV 377,15), Servius (K. IV 433,12), Cledonius (K. V 44,6), Pompeius V 170,32),

[4] Varro called the ablative 'sextus casus': hunc tamen Varro sextum, interdum Latinum appellat (Diomedes K. I 302,5; so, also, Consentius, K. V 351,9). Quintilian is disposed to divide it into two, making the instrumental a 'septimus casus': (I 4,26) quaerat etiam, sitne....apud nos quoque septimi. nam cum dico 'hasta percussi', non utor ablativi natura, nec si idem Graece dicam, dativi. Charisius (K. I 154,11) and

preposition the 'septimus casus' does not: (36,8) nos tamen hoc dicimus, quod septimus cassus ablativo hoc tantum distat, quod ablativus praepossitionem recipiat, septimus autem cassus certis cassibus certisque verbis hereat. dicis enim ablativo cassu *ab hac regione venerunt* septimo autem *hac regione praediti sunt* sicut et *laude digni* et *arte macti.* And at 162,2 ff. he reports that Galbungus and Aeneas called the ablative absolute 'octavus casus'. [1]

In his own use of cases — if we may trust the spelling of the manuscripts — there are some irregularities. At 115,20 we have the accusative instead of the nominative: sequentem syllabam producta est (*produces,* Stangl, p. 73). So at 130,20, est et aliam causam (*alia causa,* Stangl. p. 79); at 133,8, maiorem in verbo....silvam....inveniuntur; at 157,2, quomodo sententiam intellegetur? At 9,10 the genitive is used instead of the nominative: literarum ob hoc forciosae sunt. At 167,22 he has quaestio solutionis satis indiga; at 124,13, quaestio solutionem satis indiga.

Nomen, Declaratio [2]

Virgilius says nothing about the number of declensions, and gives no examples of the various types. Donatus (K. IV 355, 28) declines *magister, musa, scamnum, sacerdos,* and *felix;* but does not mention the number of types. Servius (K. IV 408, 36) says that there are five classes, and

---

Donatus (K. IV 377,20) say that some grammarians count a seventh case; Diomedes (K. I 317,25), Pompeius (K. V 171,21) and Consentius oK. V 351,14) accept it. Priscian (K. II 190,3) rejects it, on the ground that the presence or absence of a preposition can make no difference in the case. See Jeep, 1. c., p, 136.

[1] See Jeep, p. 138. I do not find this definition of the ablative absolute elsewhere. Servius (K. IV 433,23), Cledonius (K. V 12,5 and 44,17) and Pompeius (K. V 183,22), apply octavus casus to the local dative with verbs of motion, and illustrate it by Vergil's 'it clamor caelo'. Consentius (K. V 351,17) reports that some consider the ablative in such examples as dignus munere as the octavus casus.

[2] See Jeep, 160.

that this was doubtless stated in Donatus before his treatise was abridged ('per compendium'). Pompeius (K. IV 3,4), Sergius (K. IV 496, 27), Priscian (K. III 443, 3) recognize five declensions.[1] Charisius (K. I 18,7) makes only four; Diomedes (K. I 303, 12) makes seven.[2] Virgilius' discussion of the genitive case may show the number of declensions he would make. He discusses (1) genitive in *i* (113,25), (2), *æ* (114,2), (3) *is* and (4) *us* (114,4). The use of the ending in the genitive case singular as a basis for determining declension is nowhere mentioned in Virgilius. The grammarians who make the genitive ending the test are Probus (K. IV 3,4), Sergius (K. IV 496,27), Charisius (K. I 18,7 and 537,15), Diomedes (K. I 303,12), Priscian (K. II 194,8; III 443,5). Pompeius (K. V 188,20) makes the ablative case singular the foundation for all the declensions: et bene fecerunt Romani ab ablativo singulari sumere regulas, qua ratione? quoniam iste proprius ipsorum est: ablativum enim Graeci non habent, sed Romani. Donatus[3] (K. IV 356,31; 378,3) also used the ablative case singular to determine the genitive, dative, and ablative plural. Virgilius speaks of the use of this case in determining the *ium* endings of the genitive plural (117,3): cum ablativus cassus singularis in *i* finit, sic ex aliis ergis genetivus in ium plurali finiri solet.

At 38,4 Virgilius says that all monosyllables have a second form in the nominative singular: sciendum sane, quod omnis monosyllabae declinatio duplici nominativo utatur ut *plebs plebis* et nominativo *plebis*, *ars* et *artis*, *bos* et *bovis*. Cf., also, 111,4: Sed quia de nominativo cassu dicere disposuimus, quaestio nobis ingeritur, cur uni nomini no-

---

[1] He does not make the dies type a separate declension.

[2] He distinguishes between i and ii genitives, also between genitives in us and u.

[3] See also Sergius on Donatus (K. IV 495,24), and Servius (K. IV 408,28), Consentius (K. V 359,10).

minativus singularis cassus repperiatur duplex, cum per omnes cassus una eademque sit declinatio ut dicimus *sepe sepis* et *seps sepis, Cebes Cebitis* et *Chebs Chebitis,* item *preces precis, prex precis, sedes sedis* et *ses sedis* et cetera.

At 111,21 he mentions certain nouns which have two or more 'declensions' throughout: Sunt tamen quaedam nomina quae duas per omnia declinationes habere noscuntur ut *laetitia laetamen, vocatio vocamen, praesagium praesagimen, fundamentum fundamen, monimentum monimen, calciamentum calciamen, examentum examen, stramentum stramen, firmamentum firmamen, species specimen* et cetera. immo hoc addimus quod tres vel quattuor declinationes plerisque nominibus eveniant sicut est *laetitia, laetities, laetamen.* The chief purpose of such doublets is to provide for metrical convenience, though they serve also to express difference of meaning or application: (111,10) hoc maxime propter metrorum necessitatem pedumque mensurandorum ac temporum positionem accipitur. hoc tamen sciendum, quod quoties dicatur *sepes,* lapidum ostendatur materia, cum autem scribatur *seps,* lignorum semper erit, etc.

At 37,14 f. he gives one or two interesting examples of obsolete modes of declension: sunt item nomina, quae a veteribus aliter declinantur et nunc velut recentiore instaurata peritia aliter flectuntur ut *vis vis vi vim vis vi* et pluraliter *vis vium vibus vis vis vibus.* [1] at nos dicimus *virs viris viri virum virs viri* et pluraliter *vires* et cetera. dicebant etiam *gelus gelus gelui gelum gelus gelu,* [2] non sic *gelu gelu* et cetera.

---

[1] Vis, nom. pl. and acc. pl. is occasional, and was noted by Probus, (K. IV 19,23 and 31,1); Plotius (K. VI 482,11); Priscian (K. II 249,10). See Neue, I 744, Lindsay, Archiv, X 443.

[2] The Grammatici Latini regularly say that such neuters as cornu, gelu are 'monoptota' or 'aptota' in the singular: they are cited by Neue, I 539-540. Martianus Capella, III 293, insists on a genitive singular in -us.

At 36,14 f. he gives some examples of nouns which are defective in case. *Humi* has no genitive singular — 'for *humi*[1] is dative' (36,20). *Tenebra*[2] has all the cases except the accusative singular: unde et nostri solent *tenebras* semper activo applicare verbo (37,9). *Viscere* and *verbere*[3] have no case in the singular except the ablative (37,1). *Divitiae*[4] cannot have a singular (37,12) — though *divitia* occurs at 26,2: qua divitia nomen omnibus partibus latinitatis praelatum sit.

Virus is used for vir, 91,21: Istrius virus Hispanus. *Multimodis* is accusative plural, 134,27: multimodis ac multifarias habet sententias. Both *bonus* and *bonis* are reported for the nominative singular, 'each in its own declension': (41, 23) uterque in sua declinatione repperitur dicente Lucano *bones viros urbs dedit Sicilia* et iterum Serenus *sanctem deorum cultorem quis non laudabit.* item con eundem *perfectem in cunctis oportet crescere virum.* *Opia* is the singular of *opes:* (41,20) sunt cassus extraordinariae declinationis ut opia opiae et pluraliter opes; *facia* is used for *facies*, 18,24: in sua facia praeferens; *plania* for *planities* or *planitia*, 24,15: in nobilitate virtutum et mititudinis plania.

Some people maintained that the genitive singular of the

---

[1] Diomedes (K. I 405,11); Priscian (K. III 67,5 and 377,4). Arus. Mess. (K. VII 477,31) quotes Verg. E. 3,92; Sall. Cat. 55,3; Jug. 48,3. Humi is called a genitive, but treated with all other locative forms as an 'adverbium loci in loco', Diomed. l.c. So Priscian (K. III 67,5 and 377,4) treats all these forms as 'genetivus casus pro adverbio in loco.'

[2] Apul. M., 5,20, has tenebrae (gen.); Venant. Fort. 10,17,36, has tenebra (abl.); Script. Hist. Aug. 'Commod.' 16,2 has tenebra (nom.). The singular is not recognized by Charisius (K. I 33,23 and 549,32). Diomedes (K. I 328,5); Probus (K. IV 195,27); Phocas (K. V 428,11); See Neue I 7,2.

[3] Cf. Phocas, V 428,28 K. alia ablativum tantum in singulari numero, ut....ab hoc viscere. Lucr. has viscus (nom.), 1,837, visceris (gen.) 5,903; Celsus has also the dative visceri (Neue I 172). The genitive verberis occurs in Ovid, Met. 14,821; Lucan, 3,649.

[4] So Charisius (K. I 33,23 and 549,32); Diomedes (K. I 328,5); Phocas (K. V 428,11). Nonius cites divitiam (475,25): aeternabilem divitiam partissent. See Neue I 693; Rönsch, Coll. Phil, p. 30.

second declension should always end in -ii: (113,28) licet nonnulli aestiment hunc cassum quotiescumque in -i terminatur, debere longum fieri. The school of Galbungus regularly wrote *doctus doctii* (114,10). Mitterius said that one might write either *doctus docti* or *doctius doctii*[1] — whichever his metre required. (114,12).

Virgilius says (118,10) that the old rule made such ablatives as *radiis copiis* long, but *donis verbis* etc. short. His own rule is, that all ablatives in -is are long: (118,16) ceterum novis scolis supervenientibus alia sententia supervenit. dicunt enim nostri, quod omnis dativus et ablativus cassus pluralis in is syllabam terminatus longus semper natura sit.

At 46,11 he gives an obsolete declension of what he calls the 'pronouns' *duo* and *ambo:*[2] a veteribus declinantur *dui duorum duis duos a duis*, sic et *ambi*, rectius autem declinantur *duo duum duobus duos a duobus*, sic et *ambo ambuum ambobus.*

Pronomen[3]

Virgilius makes the following distinction between nomen and pronomen: the pronomen has person, the nomen has not; the nomen has comparison, the pronomen has not: (43,17) inter pronomen autem et nomen hoc interest, quod pronomen conparatione carens personam habeat ut *ego tu ille*, nomen autem persona abiecta conparationem recipiat ut *carus carior carissimus.* This is the distinction regularly made by the grammarians.

His definition of pronomen is not the conventional one,

---

[1] Varro and Pliny doubled the i of -ius nominatives. Lucilius wrote a single i. See Charisius (K. I 78,6 and 79,1).

[2] Duo is nowhere classed as a pronoun, ambo is generally classed as a nomen, but some grammarians put it in the doubtful list. See Donatus (K. IV 381,9) and Pompeius (K. V 211,22 f.).

[3] See Jeep, p. 173.

but it comes to much the same thing: (43,8) pronomen autem est pars subministratoria orationis, quae quidem absque nominis amminiculo infirma esse videtur. sed nomen illius vel maxime eget adiumento, praesertim cum eius vicem ipso dumtaxat nomine ante prolato conplet ac retinet Flacco scribente *ut vidimus ex Hebreis virum elegantem, et mirati eum sumus atque conplexi*, non enim iterum dixit *virum admirati*. Compare Charisius (K. I 157,24): Pronomen est pars orationis quae posita pro nomine minus quidem, paene idem tamen significat.[1] Subministratoria[2] is Virgilius' way of expressing *minus quidem, paene idem significat.*

He does not treat the pronomen according to its accidentia, as he did the nomen, but comments only on particular forms. To judge from the distinction which he made between the nomen and pronomen, and from the accidentia according to which he discussed the nomen, he recognized *qualitas, genus, numerus, figura, persona, casus.* These are precisely the accidentia which are given by Donatus (K. IV 357,3).[3]

Qualitas was variously classified by the grammarians. Donatus (K. IV 379,26) makes two divisions: 'pronomina finita', 'pronomina infinita'. Of these, 'pronomina finita' have person; 'pronomina infinita' have not. Diomedes (K. I 329,5) adds a third division, 'minus quam finita': finita est quae notat certum numerum et gestum dirigit ad personam, ut ego. infinita est quae certam non recipit personam sed cuilibet potest aptari, ut quis quae quod. minus quam finita est quae certis et incertis personis aptari

---

[1] This is the conventional definition. Compare Diomedes (K. I 329,1), Probus (K. IV 131,1), Donatus (K. IV 357,1).

[2] This term is not found elsewhere.

[3] The grammarians regularly begin with a list of the accidentia of the pronomen, and then discuss them in that order. See Probus (K. IV 131,3), Priscian (K. II 577,3), Cledonius (K. V 14,13), Pompeius (K. V 200,10).

potest ut ipse. Virgilius must have followed Donatus, as we may infer from his remarks on *iste:* (125,1) Est pronomen, de quo dubitatio magna habetur, utrum finitum an infinitum sit ut *iste.* nonnulli etenim infinitum esse cum quadam diffensionis suae auctoritate hortantur ut *ego iste, tu iste, ille iste.* [1] He calls ego 'finitum': (121,13) primum in ordine pronomen finitum est *ego.*

Diomedes makes ordo one of the accidentia of the pronomen; and so speaks of 'pronomina praepositiva' such as *quis quantus,* and 'pronomina subiunctiva', such as *is tantus.* [2] Virgilius cries out with indignation against the ignorance displayed in the use of these two classes of pronomina: (128,31) Pro dolor! sane et omni miseratione dignum est, quod multi haec articula secundum ordinem corruperunt: nam quae subiunctiva esse debuerunt, praepositiva fecere: et econtrario quae praeponi opportuerat, inlegittime postponuntur secundum Gallienum in quadam epistola scribentem: *sciat hic in sese vindicatum.* debuit enim dicere *hic sciat.* Rectium quoque prauissime scribens ita affatus est: *is erat vir valde bonus et maxime prudens.* oportuit eum, si cerebri sui compos fuisset, ita conponere *erat is valde bonus vir.* Here Virgilius evidently applies praepositivus and subiunctivus to the position of certain pronouns (in this case hic and is) with reference to the verb — a meaning which the grammarians [3] did not give to them.

---

[1] Iste was classed as minus quam finita by the grammarians, who made a three-fold division of qualitas. See Servius (K. IV 410,12), Diomedes [K. I 330,19], Augustinus [K. V 507,21]; Donat. IV 379,29.

[2] Then follows the explanation: [K. I 329,21] veluti praepositiva, [ut] quis fecit? subjunctiva vel quae responsi vim habent, iste fecit; item quantus ille est, tantus ille est. Cf. Charisius [K. I 163,29], Cledonius [K. V 14,29].

[3] Pompeius [K. V 205,17] shows clearly what is meant; sunt praeterea aliqua pronomina quae inchoant elocutionem, aliqua quae subnectunt elocutionem, inchoant elocutionem ista quis: subnectunt, is puta 'quis est qui fecit iniuriam? etc. The answer cannot be 'quis est' but 'is est' [23].

Virgilius says that some think that qualis and talis are not pronouns, but adjectives (130,1) — because they are declined like adjectives (4), because they have the gender of nomina, and because adverbs are made from them (15). He cites, in answer to these reasons, the adverbs meatim tuatim suatim nostratim vestratim[1] (18). He excludes plures, which some thought should be considered a pronoun, because it can be compared (17,17).

He discusses (40,7 f.) ullus, unus, duo, ambo, tres, alter among the pronomina, and does not intimate that anyone classed them as nomina. Duo and tres only are recognized as nomina by the grammarians.[2] Unus, ambo, alter, ullus are among the list of doubtful ones given by Donatus: (K. IV 381,9) neuter uter unus [omnis] alter alius ullus ambo uterque sunt qui nomina, sunt qui pronomina existiment, ideo quod articulis in declinatione non indigent. Pompeius (K. V 211,22 f.) gives the same list as Donatus, but excludes them from the pronomina because they are not found in the list of twenty-one given by Probus.

Pronomen, Declinatio

1. *Ego, tu sibi, meus, tuus, suus.* Virgilius' own declension of all these forms is quite classical, but he mentions some interesting variants which were used by some of his contemporaries.

The complete change from the nominative *ego* to the genitive *mei* caused the grammarians of this period much difficulty: (121,12) (de quo) tam multi innumeras ventilabant quaestiones. Many claimed that *ego* was indeclinable and should be written without change in all cases and numbers:[3] (121,18) ut adfirmarent *ego* inter monoptota

---

[1] Neue cites examples of all these forms; see his index under the words.

[2] See the indices of Keil's Grammatici Latini, under duo and tres.

[3] Virgilius cites examples (122,18 ff.). Zimmer, op. cit., 1075, notes

debere semper adscribi, ut in omni numero genere et cassu *ego* singulariter diceretur. Others would reject *ego* altogether and use a nominative form *mius* to match the genitive *mei* (121,23). For *mei* Virgilius offers the variant *mis:*[1] (47,7) legimus flecti *mei* vel *mis*. He explains the usage of the two forms, as follows: hoc ita intellegendum quia *mis* non dicitur nisi de ea re, quam mihi ab aliquo repromisam spero eventuram, *mei* autem de eo quod ad praesens possedeo.

At 47,11 he mentions some shortened forms of the possessive adjective which are of especial interest to the student of the Romance languages: sunt et alia pronomina, quae in latinitate ussitate non habentur et tamen indubie recipiuntur genere masculino ut *mus*, genitivus *mi*, dativus *mo*, accusativus *mum*, vocativus *mi*, ablativus *mo* et pluraliter *mi morum mis mos o mi a mis*. feminino *ma mae mae mam o ma a ma*, pluraliter *mae marum mis mas mae a mis*, neutrum *mum*, pro quo in ussu habetur *meus*, sic erit et *tus* pro *tuus*. These are precisely the forms which must have existed in Vulgar Latin in order to produce the French forms *mon*, *ma*, *ton*, *ta*, *son*, *sa*, *mes*.[2] They are often regarded as a distinguishing trait of Gallic Latin, though they have been traced in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Sicily as well.[3] C. I. L. V, 2007 (from Opitergium)

---

that in Old Irish and Old Cymric there was only one form in the singular for the personal pronoun. See Baebler, Beiträge, p. 65.

[1] Buecheler, Lat. Decl., 75, says of the forms mis and tis: doch sind diese seit Plautus Zeit verloren. They are mentioned by the grammarians, Donatus, Charisius, Probus, Pompeius, Servius, Priscian — see Neue, II 347-8 — and they probably survived in the sermo plebeius.

[2] See Meyer-Lübke, II, p. 108; Diez, p. 470-472.

[3] G. Groeber (Archiv, I 58) saw in the mention of these shortened forms a proof that Virgilius was a Gaul; P. Geyer (Archiv, II 34) added that they might be traced in other Romance languages besides Provençal and French — but not in Tuscan. P. de Lagarde pointed to such forms as patremo signorto ziso in Boccaccio, Pucci, and Dante, and signormo in Giordano Bruno's Candelaio; and added that similar forms are still used in the colloquial speech of Naples (Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1889, p. 129). And V. Spampanato, in his edition

has *so;* a document from Southern Gaul of the year 716 has *sa;* two Italian documents of the years 737 and 744 have respectively *sis* and *sum* (sirvitium). Virgilius, however, was the first to say that such forms were actually used in colloquial speech.

At 124,10 he mentions the forms *egoego tutu:* hoc tamen pronomen conpossitiones duas recipit, vel cum ipsum illum duplicatur ut *egoego,* vel cum *met* syllabam recipiet ut *egomet:* sic *tutu, tumet, sese, semet.*

Ille, ipse. Virgilius gives some variant forms in a list of 'pronomina ignota': (45,1) nonnulla enim solo nominativo flectuntur ut *uspis* unde *uspiam;* quaedam nominativum et genitivum habent ut *illus illius, illas illae, illum, illi;* sic *ipsus ipsas ipsum*. . . . neutrum *ellum,* dativus *elli,* accusativus *ellum,* vocativus **ellum,** ablativus *ello.* sed plurali carent numero.[1]

Hic, is. Hii, nominative plural, occurs eight times. *Hiis,* dative and ablative, is more common than *his,* and occurs twenty times. **Hisdem** occurs three times: 4,9; 114,27; 115, 29. *Heae,* feminine plural, occurs once (109,15).

Hic has retained its classical meaning, and is now used also as the definite article: (46,24) articulum est hoc quod

---

of the Candelaio (Bari, 1909, p. 180), quotes from Varchi's L'Ercolano (Florence, ed. 1846, p. 256) to show that such forms were once used in Florence: dicesi 'fratelmo', in vece di fratel mio: 'sirocchiama' o 'mogliema', in luogo di sirocchia mia o moglie mia: 'fratelto' e 'figliuolto', in iscambio di fratel tuo e figliuol tuo: 'signormo' per signor mio, 'signorto', signor tuc, e 'signorso', che disse Dante, cioè signor suo: 'ziesa', che vale sua zia.

[1] For the nominative in -us cf. the form quoted by Varro (L. L. VII, 3,42): ollus lecto datus est. For examples of the neuter illum, see Rönsch, 276. The genitive illae is mentioned by Charisius (158,19 K.). Illi for illius is cited from Cato (Priscian, 228,3K.). **Ellum** is found in Plautus (Curc. 278 Uss.); ellam in Terence (Ad. 389). It should be noted, however, that Virgilius cites also a nominative, a dative, and an ablative form. The whole passage 45,1-17 may be compared with Donatus, IV 380,30 K: Sunt pronomina quae non per omnes casus declinantur, ut eccum eccam, illum ellam, cuius cuia cuium, cuiatis nostratis.

non pro nomine sed cum ipso nomine flectitur ut *hic pater.* [1]

Eccum is given as one of the 'pronomina ignota' which have five cases:[2] (45,8) sunt etiam quae penta cassibus utuntur ut *eccum*, dativus *ecco*, accusativus *eccum*, vocativus *eccum*, ablativus *ecco*. hoc masculinum est, femininum *ecca*, dativus *eccae*, accusativus *eccam*, vocativus *ecca*, ablativus *ecca*.

At 125,29 Virgilius says that some people are in doubt whether such words as *eccum ellum* are pronouns or adverbs: sunt pronomina de quibus ambigitur utrum pronomina an adverbia intellegi debeant ut *eccum ellum*. At 69,16 he calls such words as *mecum tecum* adverbs: sunt adverbia, quorum condicio ab aliis partibus orationis nascitur ut est *mecum tecum secum nobiscum vobiscum*. *me* enim accusativus cassus est, *cum* vero ablativi est praepositio et faciunt adverbium simul.[3]

Quis, qui, etc. At 57,3 we find *quis* for *quibus:* sed ea quis[4] nascuntur, primae coniugationis sunt. At 8,8 we find *quisdam* for *quibusdam:* arte ac dicione velut quisdam conpaginibus arctubusque suffunta est. At 129,18 *quis* is used for *aliquis:* sicut enim quis viatorum via proposita gradiens, etc. At 139,22 we find *quem* for *quam:*[5] quis enim sibi viam orationis finget, quem nulli prius atrivere

---

[1] «Pliny is probably responsible for the use of articulus in the sense of the definite article», Nettleship, p. 159. See Probus, IV 133,9.

[2] Neue cites only eccum eccam eccos eccas (II 986-7). Donatus (K. IV 381,3).

[3] Donatus, IV 362,28, calls mecum tecum etc. 'adverbia personalia'. So do Charisius, I 181,25; Cledonius, V 66,31; Victorinus, VI 202,3; Andax, VII 348,22. Cf. Priscian, II 593, 25 K: quaeritur, 'eccum, eccam, ellum, ellam, eccos, eccas, mecum, tecum, secum, nobiscum, vobiscum,' pronomina sint composita an adverbia?....sunt ergo sine dubio pronomina.

[4] As we shall see from the forms cited below, quis for quibus was considered regular by Virgilius.

[5] Brix, Miles Glor. 362, shows how in the earliest Latin quis was relative as well as interrogative, and could be used for the feminine. The examples cited by Neue II, 442, shows how quae gradually made a way for itself in classical Latin.

praecessores? Virgilius shows, however, that there existed in his time a very great confusion both in their use and in their declension. At 46,16 he says: *qui* et *quis*, *quae* et *qua*, *quod* et *quid* similiter inveniuntur. Here he seems to have paired them in the order, (1) relative (2) interrogative. At 130,24 he reverses the order of the first pair only, and retains the former order for the other pairs: Alia sunt pronomina, quae geminata vocantur ut *quis qui*, *quae qua*, *quod quid:* unde et in ablativo cassu habemus *a quo* vel *a qui*, *a qua* vel *a qui*, *a quibus* vel *a quis*. This might indicate that he made no distinction between *quis* and *qui*, but in his own usage *quis* is the interrogative form. Of the feminine pair (quae qua)[1] he uses only quae.

Virgilius reports that some people used *qui* for all genders and all cases:[2] (130,30) nonnulli contendunt *qui* omni generi quoaptari posse, quippe cum in ablativo dicamus *a qui viro*, *a qui muliere*, *a qui opere*, sive horum sententia stare debet, *qui* per omnen numerum omnenque cassum monoptota quadam declinatione fruetur, ut qui vir, qui viri, qui viro, qui virum, qui mulier, qui mulieris et qui mulieres, qui mulierum; qui nomen, qui nominis, qui nomina, qui nominum et cetera huiusmodi. Others avoided confusion by a change of declension in each of the three pairs—quis qui, quae qua, quod quid. These declensions are given at 131,6: quidam separatim utrumque pronomen flecti conantur et sic habent: quis, quuius, quui, quem, a quo; qui, quorum, quibus, quos, a quibus. alia vice qui, quius, quium, o, o qui et in plurali numero duo *ii* ponuntur, ut quii, quium, quiis, quios, o, a quiis. sic et quae, cuius, cui (qui duo cassus per *c* propter discretionem harum declinationum non secus ponuntur) quam, o, a qua: et in pluraliter quae,

---

[1] Qua is clearly an analogical form made to complete the three pairs.

[2] It had already been used as the masculine nominative (both singular and plural) and as the singular ablative of all genders. Moreover its pronunciation was identical with that of the dative cui: cf. the spelling of quoaptari, 130,30.

quarum, quibus, quas, a quibus. altera vice qua et in genitivo per duo ee quaeae, quaeae, quaeam, a quaea vel a qui, quaeae, quaearum, quis, quaeas, a quiis: et neutraliter quod, quius, quui, quod, o a quo, quae, quorum, quibus, quae, o, a quibus, et pluraliter quaeae, quaeeorum vel quium, ut melius videtur, quis quaeae, (quibus), o, a quibus.[1]

Verbum[2]

Virgilius regarded *verbum* as a compound of two 'modi' (*ver* and *bum*): (50,6) verbum igitur duobus ex modis constat *ver* ex *verbere*, quod lingua gutturi infligit, *bum* ex *bucino*, quod vox *reboat.* nam sicut homo ex corpore constat et anima ita et verbum ex lingua et voce. Augustinus (see K. VIII 205,21) also regarded it as a compound (*-vere boando*, i. e., *vere sonando*).[3] The derivation usually given is *verberatus aëris.* So, for example Priscian (K. II 367, 7): verbum autem quamvis a verberatu aëris dicitur; Cledonius (K. V 10,10) has verbum, quod verberat os motus linguae reductus. See also Pompeius (K. V 97,8).

Virgilius does not define *verbum* except to call it a part of speech (134,11) which has certain accidentia (50,10). Donatus gives the following definition: (K. IV 359,4) Verbum quid est? Pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans. He then states the accidentia. Consentius says (K. V 365,29): verbum est pars orationis factum aliquod habi-

---

[1] For confusion in other authors of late Latin compare Bonnet, p. 389: Rönsch, p. 276.

[2] See Jeep, p. 185.

[3] See August. Dial., p. 9,13: verbum enim cum dicimus, inquiunt, prima eius syllaba verum significat, secunda sonum; hoc enim volunt esse 'bum'.........ergo verbum dictum est quasi a verum boando, hoc est verum sonando. Cf. Priscian's derivation of vox (K. II, 6,5), 'vox' autem dicta est vel a vocando, ut 'dux' a ducendo, vel ἀπὸ τοῦ βοῶ, ut quibusdam placet.

tumve significans cum tempore et persona, sine casu. factum quod significatur agentis aut patientis vim continet: agentis, ut seco uro: patientis, ut secor uror. cum vero neutrum horum significationi inest, habitus quidam tantum modo demonstratur, ut est sto sapio vivo. See also Priscian (K. II 369,2), Asper (K. VIII 18,10).

In his epitomae Virgilius discusses the verb according to seven *species*,[1] in the following order: 1 qualitas (50,13); 2 coniugatio (58,8); 3 numerus (60,18); 4 figura (60,25); 5 persona (62,12); 6 significatio (63,8); 7 tempus (64,9). Donatus (K. IV 359,6) counts the same number and employs the same terms, except that he has genus[2] instead of significatio. Virgilius says that some people use genus, but that he has rejected it, because it should be applied only to nomina (63,9). Most of the grammarians recognized either genus or significatio. Diomedes (K. I 334,12) and Priscian (K. II 373,10) prefer significatio to genus.

With reference to the order in which the accidentia are treated, no two of the grammarians agree entirely.[3] Virgilius (51,7), Donatus (K. IV 358,6), Pompeius (K. V 213,36), and Cledonius (K. 53,31) agree in giving qualitas the first place, coniugatio the second. They also include under qualitas, modi and formae. In Diomedes (K. I 342, 29) qualitas includes formae only; modus is an accidens. Priscian (K. II 369,16 and 427,10) instead of qualitas uses species, which includes formae only: he also makes modus an accidens. Charisius (K. I 164,16) uses the adjectives finita and infinita to distinguish between a finite verb and an infinitive.[4]

In his Epistolae Virgilius says (134,13) that many people [5]

---

[1] The grammarians call them accidentia.

[2] Charisius (K. I 144,22), Pompeius (K. V 213,36) have genus only.

[3] The commentators on Donatus follow his order.

[4] See also Victorinus (K. VI 199,24).

[5] Galbungus and Cornilius made such a division (134,20).

regard the verbum not as a single part of speech, but as twelve parts: 1 status, 2 formatio, 3 ordinatio, 4 moderatio, 5 subfiguratio, 6 adnumeratio, 7 immotatio, 8 indagatio, 9 adfirmatio, 10 inchogatio, 11 praelatio, 12 declinatio. And he himself here treats the verb according to this division.

There is nothing in the Epitomae which corresponds to this use of status. I find nothing like it in the grammarians. At 134,31 he defines it: Status igitur verbi hic est, quod omnis dictio atque ratio vel sententia usque ad verbi locutionem differtur et quodammodo mutificatur. Some call it virtus (135,2). The whole purpose of the discussion of status is to show the superiority of the verbum over all the other parts of speech. Cornilius likened it to a king whose moods are many and varied: (133,30) quia verbum simile esse debet regi, cuius animi status multi et diversi sunt: non enim in sedatu et bello uno modo regnat neque in gaudio et tristitia, aliquoties enim rigidum esse, aliquoties mitem, modo fortitudinem regiae potestatis ostendere, modo clementiam et infirmam quodammodo proferre lenitatem. simile etiam modo verbum multos in sese continet status: nunc enim fortitudinem infirmis largitur, nunc fortibus aufert firmitatem. So Pompeius remarks upon the superiority of the verb: (K. V 212,4) pars ista artis id est de verbo, quo maior est, eo etiam uberior et rationabilior at utilior. He says further that the term 'verbum' means 'verberato aëre ictu linguae'—a process by which all the parts of speech are uttered. But, since the verb is used more often than any other part of speech, it alone received this name (K. V 149,28 f.).

Formatio (135,15) and moderatio (144,11) of the Epistolae correspond to qualitas of the Epitomae. This Virgilius divides into formae and modi (51,7),

Ordinatio (142,27) corresponds to coniugatio.

Subfiguratio (148,26) corresponds to figura composita.

Adnumeratio (149,33 f.) has nothing to correspond to it. It is the process of calling over the parts that go to make

up each species, and then summing them up.

Inmotatio (151,20f.) is concerned with the different methods of obtaining emphasis or distinguishing shades of meaning: 1 by doubling consonants (aggo for ago, 151, 28); 2 by intonation (légo and legó, 152,21)(1); 3 by feeling ('per sensus'), which seems to mean the ability to distinguish between two words of similar spelling but of different meaning, e. g., credo, credo (152,26); 4 by the use of different prepositions in verb compounds, e. g., construo, adstruo (153,9); 5 by the use of a present tense where proper sequence would demand a past tense (153,14).

Indagatio (153,20) is the grouping of verbs into conjugations according to the vowels *a e i*, also the arranging of the verb according to tempus.

Affirmatio (154,1 f.) is the use of two synonyms for the sake of emphasis: *reges Romanos aequa et vera sententia credimus et fidimus.*

Inchogatio (154,12) has reference to inchoative verbs, and corresponds to one of the formae, which is a division of qualitas.

Praelatio (154,32) corresponds to ordo, which some of the grammarians regard as an accidens. It applies only to the 'modi'.

Declinatio is the inflection of the verb.

Qualitas (A Modi)[1]

Virgilius recognizes seven modes: indicative (51,11), imperative (51,16), optative (52,8), subjunctive (53,5), infinitive (53,10), impersonal (54,9), gerund, or verba gerundi vel typici (56,10). The Grammatici Latini all agree that the first five of these are 'modi'. Diomedes (K. I 338,13) and Priscian (K. II 421,18) recognize only five. Donatus (K. IV 381,18) has an impersonal mode, but pre-

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 216.

fers to call it a '*genus*'[1] instead of a '*modus*'. Servius on Donatus (K. IV 411,29) adds a seventh mode, '*gerundi*'. The other grammarians give varying numbers of modes, from seven to ten.

Virgilius has followed the traditional order[2] of the grammarians, but comments upon an arrangment prevalent among some of his contemporaries, based upon the order of the vowels; viz, 1 imperative, based upon the *a* of the first conjugation in this mode: (144,23) ita ut ab imperativo modo declinationem verbi exordirentur; praecipue si in *a* literam desineret, ut *macta liga planta.* 2 Infinitive based upon the final *e*: (144,25) et ab hoc modo finito infinitivus modus sequeretur, quia in *e* literam finiatur ut *mactare ligare plantare.* 3 Indicative based upon the perfect ending *i* and the present ending *o:* (144,27) deinde post hunc tutum, cum ad indicativum ventum fuisset, a praeterito tempore perfecto incipientes, quod *vi* litera finitur ut *mactavi ligavi plantavi,* in praesenti tempore finem verbo statuerent, quia in *o* terminatur ut *macto ligo planto.*[3]

Modus indicativus:[4] Virgilius says that the indicative mode gets its name from the fact it indicates 'per ipsum' what has been done, what is being done, and what will be done: (51,14) hic autem ob hoc indicativus dicitur, quia et quae acta sunt et quae aguntur et quae agebuntur per ipsum indicantur ut *vido vidavi vidabo.* Compare Cledonius (K. V 54,6), indicativus ob hoc dicitur quia quae indicamus pronuntiando dicimus; Servius on Donatus (K. IV 411,30), indicativus dicitur modus, quoniam per ipsum quod geri-

---

[1] See also for this classification Pompeius (K. IV 216,16) and Macrobius (K. VIII 48,20).

[2] This order is explained by Priscian (K. II 423,24 f.)

[3] I find no traditional basis for this theory.

[4] 'Indicativus' (Charis., Dosith., Victorin., Audax); 'indicativus qui et pronuntiativus' (Donat., Prob,. Consent.); 'indicativus sive definitivus' (Prisc. K. II 421,18); 'finitus' (Diomedes, K I 338,17).

mus indicamus. Virgilius calls this the strongest of the modes (51,11), Primus et fortissimus indicativus nominatur. Many call it the modus rectus, and the others the modi proclivi: (51,12) quem rectum ex omnibus multi vocant, ceteros autem proclivos. Macrobius (K. V 611,36) says: denique Stoici hunc (indicativum) solum modum rectum, veluti nominativum et reliquos obliquos, sicut casus nominum, vocaverunt. [1]

Modus imperativus: This mode is the second in order: (51,16) imperativus secundus est, per quem omne quod effici debet, imperatur ut *vida.* Virgilius says (51,18) that some people would put it ahead of the indicative, [2] but that 'Aeneas' and 'Cicero' insisted that in good authors it always came second, especially because it had no first person. [3] Compare Priscian (K. II 423,26), imperativus est, quo imperamus aliis, ut faciant aliquid vel patiantur, qui ideo secundum tenuit locum, quod per se absolutus quemaduodum indicativus, non indiget auxilio alterius partis ad plenam significationem, licet per tempora et personas deficiat naturaliter.

Modus optativus: Virgilius' conception of this mode is the common one of the grammarians: (52,8) optativus modus dicitur, per quem omne quod concupiscible animo fit, optatur. [4] unde et adverbium optandi frequenter adsumit hoc est *utinam* cuius est sensus *vellim.* Some of the grammarians say simply: optativus dicitur, quoniam habet adverbium optantis; so Servius (K. IV 441,31), Pompeius (K. V 215,20).

The explanation of utinam by vellim raised a question

---

[1] Priscian (K. III 431,14) uses the epithet rectus, but proclivi for obliqui is not found in the grammarians.

[2] See, also, 144,21.

[3] Some people recognized a first person singular, and conjugate laudem, lauda vel laudes (145,11); cf. Diomed. K. V 338,31.

[4] Cf. Diomedes (K. I 340,5), unde ab optando optativus dictus est. See also Cledonius (K. V 54,7).

as to the propriety of putting it with any person but the first. This is answered by translating *utinam* by *vellis* in the second person. Virgilius says that when *ut* is used instead of *utinam*, the meaning is different; that Aeneas would then speak of a modus causativus[1] (52,18).

Virgilius himself recognizes three tenses for the optative: (52,20) aboritur alia quaestio in hoc eodem modo, quare optativus modus non solitum temporum numerum suppleat, sicut indicativus et coniunctativus, sed tantum trina declinatione coniunctis dumtaxat duobus in unum temporibus sic flectitur. These were: future, ut audiam (65,16); present, utinam rogarem (148,9); past, utinam rogassem (148, 11). Many people rejected the future tense, and, omitting the *ut*, called the verb an imperative[2] (65,16 f.). Macrobius (K. V 620,24) tells what the Latins have done with respect to the tenses of the optative: in hoc enim modo Latini tempora Graecorum more coniungunt, imperfectum cum praesenti, plusquamperfectum cum perfecto, et hoc adsignant duobus antecedentibus, quod in coniunctivo praeteriti imperfecti fuit, utinam legerem, hoc duobus sequentibus, quod in coniunctivo plusquamperfecti fuit, et hoc dant futuro, quod habuit coniunctivus praesentis, utinam legam. Priscian regards the future optative as perfectly natural; the praeteritum tempus, he says, may seem strange (K. II 407,10 f.). See, also, Cledonius (K. V 20, 24). Consentius (K. V 375,3f.), Diomedes (K. I 391, 18f.).

Modus coniunctivus.[3] Virgilius explains the name: (53, 5) coniunctivus modus duas ob causas sic vocatur vel propter coniunctionum partes, quae adiunguntur, ut *scilicet quamquam quamuis quamlibet nisi sin*, vel quod propter in quassorum conpositione coniunctativus modus praece-

---

[1] No such distinction is made by the Grammatici Latini.

[2] Compare 145, 9 f.

[3] Virgilius sometimes uses the form 'coniunctativus'. See Huemer's Index.

denti indicativo copulatur ut *cum videm.*[1] Compare Cledonius (K. V 16,14): Coniunctivus ideo dictus, quia solus sensum implere non potest. Priscian calls this a modus *subiunctivus*, and says: (K. II 424,12) Quartus est subiunctivus [quippe iure]. qui eget non modo adverbio vel coniunctione, verum etiam altero verbo, ut perfectum significet sensum.

Modus infinitivus: This mode Virgilius characterizes as follows: (53,10) infinitivus modus a quibusdam communicativus[2] vocitatur pro eo videlicet, quod vel nomini et verbo vel omnibus personis verborum numerisque communis habeatur. Priscian calls it *modus infinitus:* (K. II 425,9) Infinitus est qui et personis et numeris deficit, unde et nomen accepit infiniti, quod nec personas nec numeros definit et eget uno ex quattuor supra dictis modis ut significet aliquid perfectum. Compare Pompeius (K. V 215,39): infinitivus dicitur modus ab eo quod non definiat personas; also Augustinus (K. V 510,38): nunc de modo infinito, qui ideo infinitus dicitur, quia superiores definiunt personas primam secundam et tertiam; hic autem modus sine personis est et habet solum tempus praefinitum praesens praeteritum et futurum.

The infinitive as a Substantive: Virgilius says that an infinitive can be used only in the nominative, accusative and ablative singular:[3] (53,12) hoc sane sciendum quod

---

[1] So Pompeius says that coniunctivus is so named, not because it has the particle cum (K. V 215,19), but because it joins the indicative to itself to express its meaning (K. V 215,36), ergo ideo dicitur coniunctivus modus, quod coniungit sibi indicativum modum ad exprimendum sensum suum. Charis., Dosith., Consent., Victorin.; Audax prefer 'coniunctivus'. Prob., Sacerdos, and Priscian prefer 'subiunctivus'.

[2] The name is not found elsewhere. For 'perpetuus' see Diomedes (K. I 340,34); Probus (K. IV 156,2); Consentius (K. V 375,14). For 'impersonativus' and 'insignificativus' see Diomedes (K. I 340,37).

[3] For the history of this construction, see Schmalz, p.419, n. 2;Diez, p. 921; Meyer-Lübke, II 482. Schmalz says that in Classical Latin the infinitive was used only in the nominative and accusative, but by Tertullian's day it could be used in all the cases.

infinitivus modus, quandocumque pro nomine[1] accipiatur, trium tantum cassum vicem expleat, nominativi scilicet et accussativi ablativique, quod semper pro neutralis generis significatione numero dumtaxat singulari solebit evenire. For this usage he quotes the following illustrations: (54,1) quid tam iocundum nobis esse potest, quam in hoc nostro dilegere permanere; (54,4) solis currere die aestivo iocundissimum est; (54,8) lexisti assiduum bellare in toto curriculo vitae.

Modus impersonalis: The grammarians[2] who regard the impersonal as a mode recognize that it may also be classed as a 'genus'.[3] Virgilius gives no hint of this. His contemporary Terrentius claimed that the impersonal mode is found in any 'genus' except the passive:[4] (147,9) inpersonale verbum ab omni verbo significatorio, id est tam activo quam deponenti, tam neutrali quam communi, nasci indubitali assertione solere excepto passivo; in the passive of the third person, the personal and impersonal coincide: (147,12) nam quod ab activo tertiae personae verbi passivi similitudine dirivatur, passivum iterum non repetit, praesertim cum passivum verbum absque nominativo cassu asseri non valeat. Galbungus claimed that impersonal verbs are found only in active and neuter 'genera' (147, 15).[5] Virgilius agrees with Terrentius. The impersonal verbs *oportet pudet taedet paenitet decet* are classed as exceptions to this rule, because they have no personal form.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Priscian (K. II 425, 9, quoted above; II 408, 27). At 422, 8 he states that some preferred to consider the infinitive as an adverb.

[2] So Donatus (K. IV 383, 18), Servius (K. IV 411, 27).

[3] So Pompeius (K. V 216, 16), Consentius (K. V 37, 23).

[4] The passive was excepted because, they said, an impersonal verb cannot be derived from itself (55, 15).

[5] So Priscian (K. II 425, 13); but cf. 432, 9. See, also, Consent. (K. V 372, 14), Serg. Explanat. in Donat. (K. IV 549, 5).

[6] Some of his contemporaries admitted the forms paenites, etc. to make the rule uniform (55,17). Compare Commentum einsidlense (K. VIII 252, 24).

Virgilius' test for impersonal verbs may be illustrated from his comment on *placet.* In the expression *placet mihi hic sermo*, placet is personal because it has a nominative case, *sermo*, as suject: (55,24) si ergo haec nominativum cassum admiserint, manifestum est, quod tertiae personae sunt ut *placet mihi hic sermo.* In the expression *placet mihi dicere*, placet is impersonal, since it has the dative case joined to it and is followed by the infinitive: (56, 2) si vero dativum cassum habuerint sibi adiunctum, quem infinitivus modus sequatur, apparet, quod inpersonalia sunt ut *placet mihi dicere.* Compare this with the rule given by Asper (K. VIII 48, 20): Nam propterea inpersonalis dicitur, quod cum dicis legitur, non ostendis a quo legatur; also Cledonius (K. V 16, 18): inpersonalis modus est, qui de significatione sua personas non facit, sed de pronominibus personas sumit, ut legitur a me, a te, ab illo vel ab eo; Explanat. in Donat. (K. V 550,25); Pompeius (K. V 216,19).

Modus gerundi: The modus gerundi, or as Virgilius terms it, verba gerendi vel typici (56,10), seems to be the result of an attempt on the part of certain of the Grammatici Latini to discriminate between the gerund with its active meaning and the gerundive, or future passive participle, with its passive meaning. On this point compare Servius on Donatus (K. IV 412,18-25), Cledonius (K. V 17, 18), Pompeius (K. V 218,20), Macrobius (K. V 626,29), Sergius on Donatus (K. IV 504, 37). Virgilius himself discusses this so-called mode under participles, and not under modes, where he merely states that it is a mode (56, 10). The teachers of Virgilius held that this mode was derived from the future passive participle:[1] (70,23) gerendi vel typici verba de participiis dirivata fideles quique doctorum ita intellegunt, ut eligendi genitivum participii

---

[1] Macrobius (K. V 626, 28) hanc (sic) quidam gerundi modum vel participalem vocant, quia verba eius paene omnia similia participiis sunt et sola significatione distantia.

verbi passivi, temporis futuri. And some people used the nominative case: (71,3) unde et quidam nominativo cassu huius participii in eandem formam ussi sunt.

At 71,6 Virgilius explains the name: gerendi autem verba dicuntur, quia opus quod natura non erat suum, vi aliqua gerunt. He also calls this mode typicalis,[1] because it was formed on the model of the future passive participle: (71,9) typici autem verba ideo dicuntur, quia ex praedicto participio typicata sunt.

Qualitas B: Formae[2]

Virgilius in his Epitomae gives four formae, in the following order: forma perfecta (56,14), forma meditativa (56,16), forma frequentativa (56,20), forma inchoativa (57,14). In his Epistolae he treats forma meditativa last (140,23). Donatus (K. IV 359,10) employs the same names in the same order; so, also, Audax (K. VII 345,1). The usual order is meditativa, inchoativa, perfecta, frequentativa. Pompeius explains why they were so arranged: [3] (K. V 219,5) formae sunt quattuor, meditativa inchoativa perfecta et frequentativa. hae formae secundum naturalem artem conpositae sunt. nam re vera omne quod agimus quaerit primo adsumptionem consilii; deinde cum sumpserimus consilium ut inchoemus; cum inchoaverimus, ut possimus perficere; cum perfectum fuerit, ut, si placeat, frequentius hoc utamur. ideo et istum ordinem tenuit. Virgilius evidently puts forma perfecta first because of its completeness (56,15).

Forma perfecta. Virgilius dismisses this in few words: (56,14) Nunc de formis verborum paucis licet diserendum

---

[1] In Commentum Einsidlense (K. VIII 210,10) we find 'typicus modus'. The Grammatici Latini do not use this expression.

[2] See Jeep, p. 187.

[3] See Servius (K. IV 412, 28), Victorinus (K. VI 200,1). Cledonius (K. V 17,31). For a different division, see Priscian K. II 342, 29.

est, quae formae IIII sunt: prima harum perfecta est, quae per omnes modos numeros figuras personas tempora perfecta declinatur. Compare Audax (K. VII 345,2): Perfecta forma cur dicitur? quia plenus est in ea indicantis sensus ut lego. See, also, Pompeius (K. V 220,10). Diomedes calls it forma absoluta: (K. I 342,33) absoluta verborum qualitas est quae semel vel absolute aliquid facere nos indicat, ut curro. Pris. (K. II 407,12) calls it 'primitiva'.

Forma frequentativa. As for frequentatives, Virgilius says (136,22): formae ergo sunt evidentes atque usitatae, quarum prima frequentativa nominatur; quod in Galbungi scola sumi non erat solitum, sed magis adiectivam [1] dicere consuerunt, dicentes eam non literis modo, verum etiam sensibus adiciendam esse. quidam non adiectivam sed accumulativam [2] vocitarunt: cum enim dicis *victito*, hoc intellegi das, quasi id dixeris *magis ac magis vinco*. *Saepe* [3] and *frequenter* are the words commonly used to explain frequentatives: compare Servius (K. IV 411, 36) quarta est frequentativa, quae nos aliquid saepe agere ostendit, ut lectito: significat enim saepe lego; Cledonius (K. V 16, 28) frequentativa est quae nos ostendit frequenter aliquid facere.

Virgilius says that some verbs have two frequentative formae: (57,8) sunt et non pauca in eadem forma per quosdam gradus tam literis quam intellectu crescentia. dicimus enim *curro curso cursito*, sed *curro* hoc tantum significat, quod in itinere possitus nullam facio conperendinationem, *curso* autem paulo citius aliqua necessitate extorquente festinare cogor, at *cursito* quando hoste me insequente fugio. Compare Plotius (K. VI 431,12): haec duo gradus recipit ut

---

[1] I do not find this epithet elsewhere applied to forma.

[2] This name is not used by the grammarians.

[3] Virgilius uses saepe at 56,21: dicito hoc est sepe dico.

aucto et auctito, curso et cursito. Again Virgilius says (139,4): [Regulus] dicebat etinam unumquodque[1] verbum duas habere formas frequentativas vel tres ut lego lecto legito lectito. Compare Donatus (K. IV 382, 4): et frequentativa saepe in tres gradus ducunt verbum, ut curro curso cursito, saepe in duos tantum, ut volo volito.

Forma inchoativa. With reference to this form, Virgilius says (138,3): inchogativa forma est quae inchogari quidem sed non finiri videtur. Compare Pompeius (K. V 219,18): Inchoativa est ista quae nos aliquid inchoare ostendit....sed fieri plus quidam significat ab illa priore, ut est calesco. This idea of entrance upon an action is to be found in the definition of the grammarians in general. Priscian says simply: (K. II 429,16) ut inchoativa, quae initium actus vel passionis significat.

Virgilius gives three ways of testing inchoative verbs: 1 they will have no perfect tense; 2 they will be of the third conjugation; 3 they will come from regular verbs of the second conjugation: (57,17) quaecumque enim verba verae formae inchogativae....et tertiae coniugationis erunt ut *floresco lucesco feruesco calesco* et cetera. nascuntur autem haec ex verbis secundae coniugationis formae perfectae ut *floreo luceo ferueo caleo.* Compare Pompeius (K. V 219, 20): haec regula quinque rebus tenetur; nisi quinque res istae fuerint, non potest stare, ut oriatur a neutrali, ut in sco syllabam exeat, ut careat tempore praeterito *perfecto* et plusquamperfecto, ut careat participio futuri, ut sit tertiae coniugationis correpta. See, also, Donatus (K. IV 381,30), Probus (K. V 158,1).

Forma meditativa. Virgilius gives the following brief comments on the forma meditativa (56,16) secunda est meditiva, quae aliquoties meditatur sed non perficitur. uno enim modo et una persona quasi prima et hoc raro invenitur ut *facturio*, tanquam si dicat *dicere quandoque propono;*

---

[1] No grammarians say this.

(140,23) de forma vero meditativa multi ambigunt utrum penitus esse debeat an non, multis negantibus et aliis adfirmantibus.[1] He employs *propono* where the grammarians use *volo*. Compare Servius on Donatus (K. IV 412,32): una enim meditativa, quae non agere nos aliquid, sed adhuc velle agere ostendit, ut est lecturio; significat enim non lego, sed legere volo. Consentius' explanation approaches more nearly the *propono* of Virgilius: (K. V 376,4) meditativa (verba) sunt quibus non actus, sed agendi apparatus ostenditur, ut amaturio. See, also, Priscian (K. II 429,19) and Sergius (K. IV 505,16).

Verbum, Coniugatio.[2]

Virgilius, in his Epitomae, employs the term *coniugatio*, but in his Epistolae, *ordinatio:* (141,12) ordinatio ergo est, quam coniugationem verborum consuetudinarie nominamus: nam quod iugum in literis sonat, ipse manifestatim ordo tenet. unde rati sunt maiorum plurimi non coniugationes sed ordinationes scribendas esse. Charisius employs *ordo* instead of *coniugatio*: (K. I 168,35) Ordines verborum sunt quattuor, qui verba dispertiunt. Also, he calls the inflexion of the verb *declinatio:* (K. I 169,11) *Declinatio verbi ordinis primi.* Virgilius likewise uses *declinatio* to designate the inflexion of the verb: (66,17) sunt et alia quae declinatione difficillima sunt ut *fio fis fit.*

Virgilius' own idea of *coniugatio* is a grouping, or arrangement, of verbs according to the natural order of the three vowels, *a, e, i:* (153,22) in coniugatione, quidem per tres literas principales indagatur, quae sunt *a e i*, quibus quasi quadam indagine a secunda persona modi indicativi omnis coniugatio per singulos modos dinoscitur ut *laudas*

---

[1] Wölfflin (Archiv I 409) says that these verbs are carefully avoided in Tragedy and in the Epic; that in late Latin they are seldom found; and that in the Romance Languages they have completely disappeared.

[2] See Jeep, p. 245.

fulges sepis. Compare, also 141,14, nam quod iugum in literis sonat, ipse manifestatim ordo tenet; and 58,12, quidam quidem hoc in fine habent, quod ideo coniugatio vocetur, quia tota latinitas his tribus coniugationibus velut quodam iugo sustentatur. alii vero propter ordinem literarum coniugationes verborum putant esse ordinandas eo, quod hae literae iugum quoddam verbis praestant a se portandis. Priscian's explanation (II 442,24) is: 'coniugatio' autem nominatur vel propter coniugatas consonantes, hoc est cognatas, ex quibus pleraeque apud Graecos coniugtiones regulam sumunt, vel quod una eademque ratione declinationis plurima coniugantur verba, quod magis ad Latinorum naminationem aptius est. Augustinus (K. V 511,41) says: nam inde dicitur coniugatio, quod sibi ad unum sonum multa coniugat.

Priscian's actual definition of *coniugatio* (K. II 442,18) is: coniugatio est consequens verborum declinatio. Consentius (K. V 380,29) says: coniugatio est collectio quaedam....verborum simili declinatione currentium.

Virgilius recognizes three regular conjugations: (58,10) Coniugationes tres sunt. Cominianus (K. I 175,31), Pompeius, (K. V 222,15), Phocas (K. I 430,21), recognize only three. Diomedes (K. I 347,16), Probus (K. IV 33,18), Donatus (K. IV 359,23) divide the third conjugation into the *is* and *īs*, according to the second person singular of the present indicative. Virgilius, though he does not make such a division, evidently had a traditional knowledge of it: (142,15) Quod autem dicturos nos fore promisimus, hoc est, quod tertia coniugatio producta in specialibus intellegatur modis. Priscian speaks of four conjugations: (K. II 442,23) sunt igitur coniugationes quattuor apud Latinos, cum apud Graecos decem sint; cf. Charis. (K. I 168,35), Eutyches (K. V 449,16).

Virgilius classed the verbs according to the vowels *a*, *e*, *i:* (58,10) prima ab *a*, secunda ab *e*, tertia ab *i*. Again at 59,11 he says: omnis coniugatio in omni verbo activo et neutrali ante novissmam literam *a* recipit vel *e* vel *i*, in

omni autem passivo communi et deponenti ante novissimam syllabam hisdem literis utitur. Compare this statement with Donatus (K. IV 359,13): prima quae est? Quae indicativo modo tempore praesenti numero singulari secunda persona verbo activo et neutrali *a* productam habet ante novissimam litteram, passivo communi et deponenti ante novissimam syllabam, ut *amo amas, amor amaris:* et futurum tempus eiusdem modi in *bo* et *bor* syllabam mittit, ut amo amabo, amor amabor.

This comparison shows what a vague and incomplete idea Virgilius—or his Epitomator—had of the rule of the Grammatici Latini. The final syllable (novissimam syllabam), to which he refers in 59,11, is the final syllable of the second person of the present indicative. Compare his own comment on *possum* and *poteo:* (59,15) sunt verba nullius coniugationis, quae in consonantem desinunt ut *sum possum* literam. est *poteo* secundae coniugationis et potentiae maioris, sed secunda persona prioris verbi *potes* corripi debet, sequentis vero producenda est *potes.* This rule was sufficient for the first and second conjugations. In the third conjugation, as seen in Virgilius and in his authorities, it was necessary, in order to distinguish verbs like *audio* from verbs *capio* or *rego*, to apply some additional test. The test chosen is the first and second person singular of the present indicative, the first person singular of the perfect indicative active, the present imperative singular active and the present infinitive: (142,15) Quod autem dicturos nos fore promisimus hoc est, quod tertia coniugatio producta in specialibus intellegatur modis, hoc est quia primo indicativo modo tempore praesenti persona prima facile dinoscatur, dicis enim *audio*, hiic *i* ante *o* habeat ut *lanio*, vel propter ea verba, quae nec tota producta, nec omnino correpta esse repperiantur: recurras ad praeteritum tempus eiusdem modi perfectum ubi nihil criposcium remansurum est ut si dicas *audivi*; dehinc ad imperativum modum ut *audi*, deinde ad infinitivum ut *audire.* For the verbs like *capio*, the 'verba fallacia', as he

calls them in 59,28, the first and second persons singular of the present indicative and the second person of the present imperative were deemed a sufficient test. For the rule of the three conjugations see also Diomedes (K. I 346, 31), Donatus (K. IV 359,13), Pompeius (K. V 223,9 and 20), Sergius (K. IV 506,34).

Virgilius says that the school of Galbungus made a fourth conjugation for the verb *eo* and its compounds.[1] He himself includes them in the type of *audio*. Donatus (K. IV 382, 28) also says that some would class verbs whose future ends in *ibo* into a fourth conjugation. Virgilius' teacher Aeneas, when asked his opinion, would say only that *eo* had two futures, *eam* and *ibo* (60,17).[2]

For the division into four conjugations as in modern usage, see especially Priscian: (K. II 442,18) Per ordinem igitur vocalium locum singulae obtinent apud nos. cum enim omnia verba, quae aequali regula declinantur, in *o* vel in 'or' desinant, in *o* quidem terminantia, si primae sint coniugationis, in 'as' efferunt secundam personam, ut 'oro oras', 'sto stas'; sin secundae, in 'es', ut 'moneo mones', 'haereo haeres'; sin tertiae, in 'is' correptam, ut 'cupio cupis', 'curro curris'; sin quartae, in 'is' productam, ut 'munio munis', 'esurio esuris'. in 'or' vero verba primae coniugationis in 'aris' faciunt secundam personam, ut 'amor amaris', 'criminor criminaris', 'luctor luctaris'; secundae in 'eris' producta paenultima, ut 'doceor doceris', 'reor reris'; tertiae in 'eris' paenultima correpta, ut 'legor legeris', sequor sequeris'; quartae in 'iris', ut 'munior muniris', 'molior moliris', 'audior audiris'. This same theory is also seen in Asper (K. V 551,29); Eutyches (K. V 450,10);

---

[1] Cf 60, 8: sunt verba, quae tertiae coniugationes productae a multis esse dicuntur ut eo et quae illi conponuntur id est praetereo praeeo introeo. sed quia hace verba nunc e, nunc i adsumunt, quam ob causam a plerisque maxime ab omni scola Galbungi, quam et ego adivi, quartae coniugationis fieri credita sunt. See, also, 142,25.

[2] Cf. 59,12 and 143,17.

Charisius (K. I 168, 35).

Virgilius conjugates *fio* in the present and imperfect indicative as in the Classical Latin: (66,17) fio fis fit, imperfectum fiebam. The perfect he gives as fui, the pluperfect as fueram: (66,19) perfectum fui, plusquam fueram. He says that many use as the optative of fio the forms forem fores foret, instead of fierem: (66,21) obtativus modus a multis declinatur forem res ret, a nonnullis fierem. Fio has also a passive voice in the present, imperfect, future, and perfect;[1] (66,22) habet passivum verbum fior firis fitur et cetera; fiebar fitus sum, futurum fiar. He gives as the imperative fiere[2] et cetera, infinitives are fieri fitum esse vel fuisse. He further states that sum has no imperfect or perfect, but gives eram eras erat as the pluperfect: (67,3) est et aliud verbum satis difficile ut sum, quod praeteritum imperfectum non habet nec perfectum nisi plusquam eram eras erat. Essem is given as the pluperfect subjunctive: (67,9) plusquam (connunctivus) cum essem. This passage indicates that the confusion between fio and sum was already an accomplished fact in the time of Virgilius.[3] The Grammatici Latini indicate no such confusion. Virgilius' own usage further indicates such a confusion. Compare, for instance, the usage of Virgilius himself in 5,18: Latinitatis autem genera sunt XII, quorum unum usitatum fitur, optatur; (3,4) sapientia autem ex sapore hic nominatur, quia sicut in corporis fit gustu, ita et in animae motu quidam sapor est; (175,30) itaque de praepositionibus haec breviter satis edicta fiant. It is evident, too, that the feeling for eram had quite disappeared, otherwise he would never have

---

[1] Priscian (K. I 337,10) says that M. Cato used **fitur** and **fiebantur**. For **fitus est**, see also Neue III, 629.

[2] Rönsch, Itala und Vulgata 294, gives this form for the imperative.

[3] See Meyer-Lübke, Gram. der Romanischen Sprachen II p. 328 and 376; Diez, 910.

reckoned it as pluperfect.[1]

Verbs found in two different conjugations. At 58,32 Virgilius says: sunt et alia verba duplicis per omnia coniugationis ut *vido vidas, video vides.* sed *vido* ad mentis oculos refferendum, *video* ad carnales. sic *tego tegas* velatio consilii est, at *tego tegis* tectum vissibile significat; sic *do das dat* isponte largiti est, *dedo dedis* vis regiae coactio est. sic Cicero dicit *conati in dedicionem Romanorum iura suscipere.* sic etiam *probo probas* alicuius rei examinatio est, at *probo probis* cum manus medicorum aegrescentium corpora contractant. sic et *volo volas* volatile est, *volo vis* voluntarium est. sic et *cogo cogis* necessitatis est, at *cogo cogas* coniunctio uxoris ad virum. *ussurpo pas* alicuius nominationis sive praesumptionis est, at *usurpeo pes* inchoatio conscriptionis.

Numerus[2]

Virgilius says simply that verbs have two numbers: (60, 18) Numeros verborum duo esse sine circuitione ulla definimus. This is the number regularly given by the grammarians, though sometimes they discuss the Greek dual. [3] He also says that there are fifty verbs which have no singular: (60,19) sunt tamen L verba, quae singularem numerum non habet ut vocitamus.[4] He does not enumerate these verbs; and there seems to be no traditional authority for the number of fifty. He says that some verbs have no plural, and cites as an example pugillito.[5]

---

[1] See Bonnet, 641.

[2] See Jeep, p. 215.

[3] Donatus (K. IV 384,1); Sacerdos (K. VI 432,7). Probus (K. IV 156, 5) counts a common number.

[4] Examples of the singular of this verb are found in Virgilius' own writings (53,11; 137,3).

[5] This word is found only in this passage.

Figura[1]

The grammarians as a rule dispose of *figura verbi* by saying that verbs are compounded just as nomina are. Compare Diomedes (K. I 335, 10): Componuntur autem verba, sicut nomina, etc. See, also, Donatus (K. V 384, 4f.), Probus (K. IV 159,35), Pompeius (K. V 234,34). Virgilius says nothing about the process of composition,[2] but discusses only the effect produced by combining different prepositions with the same verb. This he illustrates by examining some of the compounds of *clamo:* (61, 2) nam *clamo* clamoris simplicis est, *conclamo* simul cum multis; est etiam *acclamo* cum falso aliquem accuso sicut Cicero de Prassio *solis innocens acclamationibus punitus est. reclamo* aliquem exeuntem vocitans; *inclamo* et *succlamo* murmurandi est: *proclamo* laudandi vel deprecandi exaltatio; *declamo* rhetorizandi; *exclamo* quando pro viribus vocem elevo. At 148,27 he says that compositio serves three different purposes: primum ergo requirendum est quare conpositio verbo accidat? ob tres ut opinor causas, prima est quarum propter sensuum expletionem vel inmotationem: secunda propter metri compositionem: tertia est propter loquelae ipsius decorem conponendum. An example of the first is, *doceo, perdoceo* (149,4); an example of the second is *cedo concedo* (149,16): *bella Gallorum toto concessent in orbe.* hic enim *con* nihil ad sensum addidit, propter quod versum tantum explevit. He gives no example of the third.

Persona[3]

The persons of the verb are three: (62,12) Personae verborum sicut et pronominum tres sunt. Diomedes (K.

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 212.

[2] For this see Priscian (K. II 434,20f.).

[3] See Jeep, p. 243.

I 334,20) defines persona: Persona est substantia rationalis. Virgilius gives no rule for distinguishing between the persons. Donatus' method will illustrate the rule of the grammarians: (K. IV 384,17) Personae verbis accidunt tres, prima secunda tertia. prima est quae dicit, lego, secunda cui dicitur, legis, tertia de qua dicitur, legit. Virgilius claims that the Latin language does not use the first person *resum* and *resumus*[1] (62,15); that *soleo* has no second person (62,20).

Significatio, or *Genus*[2]

Virgilius implies that significatio was usually treated after coniugatio: (62,27 f.) forte enim aliquis inquirat, cur non statim post coniugationem significationem exposuerim, cum hic a plerisque possitus sit ordo. Aeneas was so much disturbed that Virgilius had not treated it in this order that he wrote to him for an explanation (62,23 f.). Virgilius explains that he had followed Gratianus, in whose school he had spent ten years. Although the Grammatici Latini differ widely in the arrangement of the accidentia verbi, significatio or genus is more frequently treated just after coniugatio. Compare Donatus (K. IV 359,6), Pompeius (K. V 213,36), Cledonius (K. V 53,30), Asper (K. VIII 48,19), Audax (K. VII 344,9).

In common with the majority of the grammarians, Virgilius counts five genera of the verb; (63,10) 1 active (11); 2 neuter (12); 3 passive (17); 4 deponent (18); 5 common (20). The usual order of the grammarians is active, passive, neuter, common, deponent.[3] Pompeius counts only two genera, active and passive: (K. V 277,5) ceterum om-

---

[1] Reesse, he says, means resedere (62,17).

[2] See Jeep, p. 167.

[3] See Pompeius (K. V 227,3 f.).

[4] Donatus (K. IV 383-2) puts common last.

ne verbum duas res significat, aut agentis aut patientis, nec potest alia inveniri significatio. So also Servius (K. IV 413,35). Probus, who regards genus and qualitas as a single accidens, adds three new genera to the five already mentioned: inchoative, frequentative, and defective (K. IV 156,10f.). For the impersonal verbs, which some treat under significatio, see *modus impersonalis* (treated above).

Virgilius defines and gives examples of each significatio: 1 *genus* activum: quaedam enim ex eis activa vocantur, quae agunt ut *Turnum colo* (63,10). 2 *genus* neutrum: quaedam neutra, quae nec agere in natura habent, nec pati licet....ut *ambulo curro* (63,12). 3 *genus* passivum: passiva sunt, quae pati semper habent ut *mittor a Romulo* (63,17). 4 *genus* deponens: deponentia sunt, quae cum passivi similitudinem in declinatione habeant, passionem tamen ipsa qualitate deponunt ut *for faris* (63,18). 5 *genus* commune: communia vere dicuntur, quae et agere et pati sub eadem declinatione habent ut *veneror regem* et *veneror a rege* (63,20). Compare Cledonius (K. V 18,34): Genera verborum quae et significationes: activa sunt quae se aliquid agere demonstrant, passiva quae pati, neutra quae nihil horum: deponentia per catantifrasin, hoc est per contrarietatem, sicut Parcae, quod nulli parcant; aut certe ideo dictum est deponens, quod deponat significationem activam: communia quae et agentis et patientis sibi vindicant significationem; et de activo passivum fit, et de passivo activum. Osculor tunc activum significat, quando accusativum casum regit, ut osculor illum; tunc passivum, quando ablativum, ut osculor ab illo: dicimus enim osculor te et osculor a te.

Tempora[1]

Virgilius says that verbs have three tenses (64,9): Tempora verborum sicut et saeculi tres[2] sunt: praeteritum praesens futurum. Compare Diomedes: (K.I 335,27) trifariam tamen cuncta gerimus, ideoque tria tempora esse dicimus, instans perfectum futurum. Virgilius further says that the ancients began the inflection of the verb with the past[3] (64,13), veteres initium declinandi a praeterito perfecto habebant; that, because they counted no imperfect as pluperfect, they then inflected the present and lastly the future (64,13f.). He says that he follows the order: present, past, future (64,16f.). For the threefold division of the past tense he offers the following explanation: (64, 20) praeteriti quoque temporis, quid sibi videatur triformis illa divissio, succinctim explicabo. praeteritum inperfectum velut praesenti proximum ob hoc dicitur, quia non certo vel condicto die temporeue sed quasi passim et aliquantis horis actum vel dictum significatur. praeteritum autem perfectum certius ac definitius factum esse monstratur; plusquam idcirco sic dicitur, quia longius et perfectius ostenditur inpletum.[4] Donatus (K. IV 360,9) says that verbs have three tenses, praesens, praeteritum, futurum; but that in the inflexion of verbs there are five tenses:[5] praesens, praeteritum imperfectum, praeteritum perfectum, praeteritum plusquamperfectum, futurum. Virgilius recognizes the same number and order: (66,17) sunt et alia quae declinatione difficillima sunt et *fio fis fit*, licet

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 239.

[2] This is the usual division made by the grammarians, but praesens comes first. See Charisius (K. I 168,6), Probus, (K. IV 155,36), Donatus (K.IV 384,10).

[3] There is no traditional warrant for this arrangement.

[4] See Diomedes' explanation of these tenses (K. I 334,39f.).

[5] This is the usual number employed by the grammarians.

secunda persona multis non placeat. inperfectum *fiebam*, perfectum *fui*, plusquam *fueram*, futurum *fiam fies fiet*, imperativus *fiat fiamus*, futurum *fito fiat*.

Of these tenses the only one which needs consideration is the future. At 58,20 Virgilius says: hoc nosse debemus, quod uniuscuiusque coniugationis verbum duplex futurum tempus habeat. dicimus enim *interrogabo* et *interrogam ges get*, *videbo videam*, *audibo audiam*, *agam agebo*. For the breaking up of the old future system and for a discussion of the leveling process to which our author is here alluding, see especially Thielmann, Archiv II, 157, and references.

At 65,8 Virgilius says: veteres etiam futurum tempus velut in duas quasdam partes dividebant ut *videbo* et *videro*, quasi aliut sit quod crastino et quod in longo tempore sit eventurum. unde et a plerisque pro futuro secundo tempore promissivum modum in ussu habebant. nos autem nec futurun secundum tempus nec promissivum modum recipientes et quod prope et quod longe futurum est, sub unius futuri temporis significatione declinamus. The interesting thing about this statement is the evidence it gives of the fact that not only the future perfect indicative but all feeling for such a tense had disappeared. The same condition is also reflected, for example, in Priscian (II,405, 18): melius tamen Romani considerata futuri natura, quae omnino incerta est, simplici in eo voce utuntur nec finiunt spatium futuri.[1] For the Classical distinction, see Asper (K. V 551,27): futuri gradus sunt duo, perfectus, ut *legam*, plusquamperfectus, ut *legero*.

Here, too, perhaps may be mentioned the process, apparently prevalent at this time, of building new verbs by using the future perfect as a present. See Virgilius 66,3: adiciuntur ut *legero ris rit*, *legerimus ritis rint* et hoc indicativo modo tempore praesenti ut sequentia declarant: in-

---

[1] See Blase.

perfectum *legerebam*, perfectum *legessi*, plusquamperfectum *legesseram*, futurum *legeram res ret*, imperativo *legere legerat legeramus legerite* vel *legeratis legerant*; futurum *legerito legerat* et pluraliter *legeramus legeritote* vel *legeratis legerant* vel *legerunto*. obtativo modo utinam 'legererem legereres legereret legereremus legereretis legererent.' 'legessissem legessisses legessisset, legessissemus setis sent'. futurum 'legeram legeras rat' sic rite per hunc ordinem declinatur et in passivo habet tempore praeterito 'legestus sum'; (137,23) 'haec vobis, amici, quasi populi mei filiis, diligenter emando et scripsero'. neque enim crededum est doctum virum (aiunt) cum copulativam coniunctionem interposuerit, non duo praesentia verba conaffixisse. unde et multi nostrorun maxime Gallorum hoc verbum primae coniugationis esse opinantur, ut dicant sepe 'scripseravi et scripserabo ac scripserare' et cetera. A collection of examples is given by Schuch, II 392. Virgilius himself uses one of these secondary forms at 8,13: de potestate autem, quia magna ex parte legestum est, bigerro sermone clefabo.

Participium[1]

Virgilius quotes his teacher Aeneas as saying that a participle, if set at the end of its sentence, may take the place of a verb: (161,14) quod si in fine testimoniorum positum fuerit, pro verbo accipiatur; quod tamen non iugi consuetudine sed raro accidit. At 72,6 he maintains that this construction is not to be explained by assuming an omission of the copula: nonnulli hoc ignorantes *est* sumunt aliunde.

At 161,19 he discusses what is now known as the 'ablative absolute'. He states that the nominative case of the participle and the ablative are often interchanged, and

---

[1] See Jeep, p. 259.

that the ablative is often found where one might expect the nominative: nominativus cassus participii modo et ablativus sepe pro se invicem ponuntur....nam pro nominativo ablativum participalem positum sepe invenimus, secundum illud Glengi: *hoste per portas rumpente cives vacillaverut.* This construction, he adds, is variously explained. Some called it a use of the seventh case, some followed the tradition of Galbungus and regarded it rather as the eighth case. Aeneas sided with the latter group; and gave an example to show what he meant by the eighth case: (162,16) octavo autem casu 'hoc prosone declamante'. But instead of this case the nominative is often used:[1] (162, 16) pro quo cassu, ut diximus, nominativus sepe ponitur ....sicut in versu Bregandi Lugenici legimus: *solus Cato miles, populus turbatus, in acie stetit.* quasi hoc dixisset: *solus populo turbato stetit.* Here again some people vainly try to explain the construction by assuming the omission of the copula: (162,23) quod multi penitus ignorantes verbum possuere *est,* quod omnino sine coniunctione causali fieri non potest.

At 163,29f. he reports a wide-spread fashion of using participles instead of finite verbs: et haec consuetudo vetusta tenuit fortitudinem per multas Africae atque Europae provincias, ut participia pro verbis sumi soleant. He quotes an example from Galbarius: (163,35) in principio quidem contuebilis mundus ab incontuebili potestate creatus, sole et luna omnibus etiam astris varia pictura splendentibus ornatus, nascituris in eo mortalibus sensus loculentissimi conlaturus adapertionem, et in omnium fine resolvendus aut etiam reformandus. This usage was not taught in the schools which he had attended; still, he is prepared to accept it, if it can be found in the highest ancient authorities: (164,15) quod si inveneremus, nos quoque imitari sententia est.

---

[1] For the history of the nominative absolute in Latin, see Schmalz, p. 391, n. 3

Many people hold that a participle cannot be compared: [1] (164,21) nam multi arbitrantur participium non posse omnino conparari, quos autenticae lectionis renuit amplitudo. Virgilius insists (164,25f.) that the present participle intransitive and the past participle passive are undoubtedly capable of comparison: e. g. *audens audentior audentissimus, doctus doctior doctissimus.* If anyone objects to his statement that the past participle active may also be compared, and insists that such words as *sapiens amens*, because of their regular comparison, should be regarded as adjectives rather than as participles, he can appeal to the high authority of Maevius: (165,16) in quo ostendit omne genus non solum appellatorum nominum, verum etiam verborum hiis praedictis gradibus conparari.

At 165,21 he gives a list of what he called participles, though others insisted that they should rather be called adjectives [2] — because the corresponding verbs were not in common use: *togatus, tunicatus, mitratus, calciatus, gladiatus, hastatus, scutatus.* But he can quote two of these verbs from Aeneas: (165,27) *milites tunicantur* and *quis gladiabitur in bello.* And he finds three others in Horatius: magno impetu facto *hastaverunt* se omnes et *calciaverunt* et *scutantes* se inruerunt (165,25). At 169,12 he quotes the rule of Aeneas, that impersonal verbs have no paticiples, and states that such forms as *decens indecens* are not parti-

---

[1] Cf. Charisius, I 48, 5, unde igitur dinoscitur et discernitur nomen a participio? quod nomen recipit conparationem et superlationem;.... participium autem non recipit. The same distinction is made by Probus, IV 142,15; Donatus, IV 388,24; Cledonius, V 37,32; Pompeius, V 258,2; Plotius, VI 444,2; Priscian, II 550,25.

[2] Donatus called such words as tunicatus galeatus 'nomina': IV 388, 12, sunt nomina speciem participiorum habentia ut tunicatus galeatus, quae quia a verbo non veniunt, non sunt participiis applicanda. So, too, Charisius, I 179,29; Cominianus ap. Charis. I 180,20; Diomedes, I 402, 23; Probus, IV 142, 34; Augustinus, V 520, 21; Priscian, II 441, 13; 562, 13. Servius regarded them as participles: IV 441, 3f., nam licet non faciat tunico galeo, tamen, quoniam tempus habent, sine dubio participia sunt. And so did Plotius, VI 444, 7.

ciples but adjectives.[1]

At 71,15 he mentions such combinations as *legens eram* (for *legebam* or *legi*), *legens ero* (for *legam*).[2] At 71,17 he reports that many of the ancients ('veteres') used to combine two futures (*salvandus ero*) or two past tenses (*salvatus fui*).[3] His own rule is, *salvandus sum* or *salvatus sum*.

Adverbium[4]

The adverb is so named because it is joined to a verb: (156,20) quia verbo semper adiungitur. But it may also qualify an adjective or another adverb — a function which some people indicate by a different name *expressorium*: (157,5) adverbium in duas partes dividunt, unam prisco nomine adverbium vocantes, alteram expressorium. etenim adverbia, quae nominibus vel aliis adverbiis applicamus, non tam adiunctionem solitam quam sensuum expressionem significant. An adverb may qualify another adverb even when there is no comparison involved, as *tam digne, valde viriliter, satis pulcre.* Here some people wrongly insert an *et:* (157,11) unde non parvum errent qui *et* coniunctionem copulativam interponunt, ut sit *satis et pulchre.*

---

[1] Cf. Diomedes, I 398,29, impersonalium declinatio non facile admittit participia, et errant qui decens pudens participia opinantur esse, cum sint appellationes. So Donatus says, IV 388,7, ab inpersonali verbo participia nisi usurpata non veniunt. But Servius says that pudet and taedet are not merely impersonal, and that pudens and taedens are genuine participles: IV 440,31, nam hoc, quod dicimus pudet taedet tantum dici, invenimus in auctoribus et pudeo et taedeo; unde fiunt pudens et taedens: participium non ab inpersonali videbitur, sed a verbo integro.

[2] For the history of this construction, see Blase, Tempora und Modi, p. 256; Diez, p. 907; Bonnet, p. 653.

[3] The Romance languages point to such combinations as salvatus fui Diez, p. 910, cites examples from the oldest diplomas in which such forms as laudatus fui, laudatus fueram, were regularly employed.

[4] See Jeep, p. 268.

Praepositio [1]

Virgilius says that all prepositions which take the accusative are freely interchanged in the 'other kinds of Latin': (74,20) in aliis latinitatis generibus pro invicem plerumque motantur. He quotes examples from Gratianus: *apud mare* for *per mare, apud Constantinopolin* for *in C.*

At 173,1f. he gives a list of 'inusitatae praepositiones' from the fourth kind of Latin (philosophical): *con* [2] pro *aput, salion* pro *ante, cyron* pro *adversus* vel *contra, trasso* pro *citra,* etc. But he states that monosyllabic prepositions have only one form in the various dialects: (173,3) hoc primitus scientes, quod monosyllabae praepositiones nullum aliud praeter usitatum genus habeant.

Coniunctio [3]

Virgilius reports a traditional division of conjunctions into five classes: [4] (169,23) cuius potestatem in quinque species divisam veteres annumerant. At 73,7 he says: quamquam in V species coniunctio divisa sit. The first class he mentions is 'copulativae':(169,26) quae numero sex sunt

---

[1] See Jeep p, 288.

[2] Virgilius himself uses **con for apud**; (42,2) con eundem; (74,22) con Gratianum; (105,3) con Persas. The confusion between **cum** and **apud** is regarded as especially characteristic of Gallic Latinity:Diez, p. 889, Dieses **apud** für **cum** wagt sich meines Wissens zuerst in Formeln und Urkunden aus der Mitte des 7. Jahr. hervor und zwar nur auf französischen Boden.

[3] See Jeep, p. 283.

[4] The traditional five classes are: copulativae, disiunctivae, expletivae, causales, rationales; so Donatus, IV 364,35; Probus; IV 143,26; Cominianus ap. Charis. I 224,29; Cledonius, V 24,8 f.; Pompeius, V 265, 18; Augustinus, V 495,27 and V 520,38; Victorinus, VI 203,3; Plotius, VI 444,24; Audax, VII 349,12. Diomedes, I 415,27, gives these five classes, but mentions some others, inlativae, optativae, etc. Palaemon, ap. Charis., I 225, 16 f. made a long list; and so did Asper, V 553, 11 f. Priscian gives seventeen classes, III 93,13.In his Epitome (72,24) Virgilius seems to recognize 'expletivae' as one class; expletiva autem

et ac at adque ast ce. Of these the last-named is Greek: (169, 27) extreme enim apud Grecos pro *et* semper ponitur. In Latin it is regularly postpositive or enclitic; in its own language it often comes first (169,28f.). In Latin it is sometimes added to a demonstrative pronoun: (170,4) ut si dicas *hicce haecce hocce isce eace idce.* The feminine nominative *ea* is a monosyllable (170,13). The proper spelling of the copulative conjunction is *ac* not *hac:* (170,17) errant etiam qui in copulativa *ac* aspirativam *h* scribunt, quae in solo habenda pronomine est.

A second class of conjuntions is 'discretivae': (170,29) *at ast sane vero porro autem ceterum.* A third is 'conplectivae': (170,1) *cum dum nam namqne quia quoniam etenim enim* et cetera. There are also 'causales' (170,17) *si nisi nisitamen verum,* etc., and 'rationales' (170,21) *ergo ideo idcirco* etc.

He speaks also of 'iterativae' (170,11) *item itemque itidem,* etc., which some people regard as adverbs: sunt tamen apud Affros scriptores, qui haec adverbia potius adfirmant esse iterandi; of 'adsimilativae' (171,24) ut *sic ita perinde;* of 'revelativae': (171,32) quae sensum revelant, ut *scilicet videlicet illicet.* And at 171,26 he speaks of 'participes', which are sometimes conjunctions, sometimes adverbs: *paulatim utique etiam equidem interea praeterea.*

Interiectio [1]

In his *Epistolae* (176,1) Virgilius says, interiectio est quidem pars orationis, sed tam inusitata, ut nisi quia a Grecis non adnumeratur, latina esse non putetur. The Greeks reckoned the interjection as an adverb. As we

---

duas ob causas sic vocantur, primum quod sensum dictionis expleant vel quod in metris locum suum obtineant iuxta illud Catonis 'virile quoque certari conpetit agmen'. hic enim 'quoque' praeter metri expletionem nullam causam habet.

[1] See Jeep, p. 292.

saw above (p.1) no Roman grammarian follows this rule except Priscian. Traces of the old theory, however, are seen in such statements as Sacerdos (K. VI 447,2), Interiectio est pars orationis *adverbio persimilis,* qua significantur animi variae passiones, quas quidam adfectus dicunt; Diomedes (K. I 419,13), plurimae dictiones incertae inter adverbia et interiectione, ut est heus heu eia em. Iulius Romanus ap. Charis. (K. I 190,14), protests against the statement that the only reason why the Romans raised the interjection to a pars orationis was because, not possessing an article, they desired to have as many parts of speech as did the Greeks. Donatus (K. IV 391,29) defends the Roman usage by saying that huiusce modi voces non statim subsequitur verbum (cf. what was said of the adverbium above).

The interjection is usually defined as pars orationis affectum (or motum) animi (or mentis) significans. Virgilius, however, disdains to define it, and contents himself with emphasizing the distinction between *vae* and *ve, eugae* and *euge;* (76,1) Interiectionum significatio et quia trita est et quia pene superuacua atque incondita a nostris iudicata est, hoc tantum dico, quia *vae eugae* cum significant adversa, diptongon in clausula sui habebunt, cum autem *ve* tantum distinguit et *euge* laetitiam ostendit, diptongon habere non est necessarium. For this distinction between *vae* and *ve* (interjection and conjunction) see Probus (K. V 146,18) and Audax (K. VII 356,15). The distinction between *eugae* and *euge* seems to be an extension of such discussions as these. To the same source may be traced Virgilius' remark (176,14) concerning the type of interjection, quae est lamentandi cum aspiratione dicenda, ut *vae,* quae tam firma est, ut a multis ambiguatur, utrum nomen an verbum an certe adverbium sit.

Many grammarians give lists of interjections. The list, however, given by Virgilius is unique and may be compared with his list of prepositions given at 173,7 f. See p. above.

Conclusion

It was said above that Virgilius the Latinist is much better than some of his own statements might lead us to expect. The foregoing investigation shows that the same may be said of Virgilius the Grammarian. To begin with, he was undoubtedly a better grammarian than the surviving record of his opinions might imply. The text is bad, and in more than one instance it has evidently suffered by epitomizing. It is evident, of course, that his treatment of the parts of speech is not complete. Logical arrangement is frequently neglected, the formal statement of accidentia is generally omitted, occasionally, even as in his treatment of the interjection, we have only a few scattered observations. It is clear, however, that his treatment was designedly informal, and in nearly every instance examination of his work as a whole has proved that he was by no means ignorant of the matters in question.

His own theories — and this, no doubt, means the theories of his teachers — are surprisingly conservative, and his own knowledge of the grammatical tradition is surprisingly complete. His most notable lapse is his treatment of the *qualitas* of nouns. But even here he evidently knows all about the accepted theory: indeed, we ourselves understand neither the meaning nor the relevancy of this weird discussion until we have gained a more than ordinary acquaintance with the long tradition from which it was ultimately derived.

It is still impossible to tell whether or not his knowledge came to him at first-hand. We can now assert, however, that in the majority of cases his indefinite *nonnulli, quidam, multi, veteres*, etc., represent the tradition of the Grammatici Latini. It is likely, therefore, that they were known to his teachers at first-hand, if not to himself. We should expect, and it is usually so stated, that the influence of Donatus was supreme. This, however, appears to be an exaggeration. The direct influence of Donatus upon

Virgilius is occasionally traceable in a technical term or some arrangement of topics. In fact, he may have had more influence upon him than any other one individual grammarian in the corpus of Grammatici Latini. But his influence was by no means supreme. Virgilius does not always agree with him. To a certain extent he is a genuine eclectic, if not always a wise one. His authorities, whether he himself knew them by name or not, include everyone of the Grammatici Latini who could have been prior to his time. It is quite possible, therefore, that Virgilius and his teachers were if anything more familiar with the tradition of Latin Grammar than are we, and that they studied it with care. But they studied it without profit, and as some of Virgilius' statements show, without comprehension. At its best Latin Grammar was more or less mechanical and confused. The tradition was still accepted, and in fact venerated by Virgilius and contemporaries. But they occupied themselves with small points, and futile discussions. In their search for the mysterious and the ineffable, so characteristic of the time, they extracted 'hidden' meanings from technical terms and otherwise obscured what little comprehension they may have had of the subject as a whole.

VITA

I was born at High Point, North Carolina, September 13, 1876. I entered Guilford College, N. C., in the autumn of 1895, and received the degree of A. B. in 1900. The following year I spent at Haverford College, Pa., and there, also, I received the degree of A. B. From 1901 to 1906 I was Instructor in Latin at Guilford College. I then spent two years in the study of Latin, Romance, and Greek at The Johns Hopkins University. I was then granted leave of absence, and in the summer of 1909 I entered the University of Berlin, where I spent three semesters attending the lectures of Professors Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Diels, Vahlen, and Norden. Since 1910 I have been Professor of Latin in Guilford College.

In the preparation of this work my especial thanks are due to my adviser, Professor Kirby Flower Smith, and to my former teacher, Professor Wilfred P. Mustard, for their unfailing kindness and invaluable criticisms. I have been greatly aided in the interpretation of this very obscure Latin author by my work in Latin Epigraphy under Professor Harry L. Wilson, and by my course in Folk Latin under Professor Edward C. Armstrong.

Clement Orestes Meredith.

Baltimore, Md., April 1, 1912.

Printed by J. M. Purdie, Guilford College, N. C.